

Betibeglogene Autotemcel for Beta Thalassemia: Effectiveness and Value

Draft Evidence Report

April 13, 2022

Prepared for



AUTHORS: Francesca L. Beaudoin, MD, PhD, MS Senior Medical Advisor Institute for Clinical and Economic Review

> Marina Richardson, MSc Health Economist Institute for Clinical and Economic Review

Patricia G. Synnott, MS, MALD Project Director, Global Health Initiatives Center for the Evaluation of Value and Risk in Health

Victoria Lancaster, PharmD, MSc, MBA Health Technology Assessment Fellow Institute for Clinical and Economic Review

Noemi Fluetsch, MSc, MPH Research Assistant, Health Economics and Outcomes Research Institute for Clinical and Economic Review

Belén Herce-Hagiwara, BA Research Assistant, Evidence Synthesis Institute for Clinical and Economic Review

Jon D. Campbell, PhD, MS Senior Vice President for Health Economics Institute for Clinical and Economic Review

Steven D. Pearson, MD, MSc President Institute for Clinical and Economic Review

David M. Rind, MD, MSc Chief Medical Officer Institute for Clinical and Economic Review

DATE OF PUBLICATION: April 13, 2022

How to cite this document: Beaudoin FL, Richardson M, Synnott PG, Lancaster V, Fluetsch N, Herce-Hagiwara B, Campbell JD, Pearson SD, Rind DM. Betibeglogene Autotemcel for Beta Thalassemia: Effectiveness and Value; Draft Evidence Report. Institute for Clinical and Economic Review, April 13, 2022. <u>https://icer.org/beta-thalassemia-2022/#timeline</u>.

Francesca Beaudoin served as the lead author for the report. Patricia Synnott led the systematic literature review and authorship of the comparative clinical effectiveness section in collaboration with Victoria Lancaster and Belén Herce-Hagiwara. Marina Richardson was responsible for the development of the cost-effectiveness model. Noemi Fluetsch was responsible for the budget impact analysis and support of other economic analyses. Jon Campbell provided oversight of the cost-effectiveness and budget impact analyses. David Rind and Steven Pearson provided methodologic guidance on the clinical and economic evaluations. We would also like to thank Maggie O'Grady and Grace Sternklar for their contributions to this report.

About ICER

The Institute for Clinical and Economic Review (ICER) is an independent non-profit research organization that evaluates medical evidence and convenes public deliberative bodies to help stakeholders interpret and apply evidence to improve patient outcomes and control costs. Through all its work, ICER seeks to help create a future in which collaborative efforts to move evidence into action provide the foundation for a more effective, efficient, and just health care system. More information about ICER is available at https://icer.org/.

The funding for this report comes from government grants and non-profit foundations, with the largest single funder being the Arnold Ventures. No funding for this work comes from health insurers, pharmacy benefit managers, or life science companies. ICER receives approximately 20% of its overall revenue from these health industry organizations to run a separate Policy Summit program, with funding approximately equally split between insurers/PBMs and life science companies. There are no life science companies relevant to this review who participate in this program include. For a complete list of funders and for more information on ICER's support, please visit <u>https://icer.org/who-we-are/independent-funding/</u>.

For drug topics, in addition to receiving recommendations <u>from the public</u>, ICER scans publicly available information and also benefits from a collaboration with <u>IPD Analytics</u>, an independent organization that performs analyses of the emerging drug pipeline for a diverse group of industry stakeholders, including payers, pharmaceutical manufacturers, providers, and wholesalers. IPD provides a tailored report on the drug pipeline on a courtesy basis to ICER but does not prioritize topics for specific ICER assessments.

About the New England CEPAC

The New England Comparative Effectiveness Public Advisory Council (New England CEPAC) – a core program of ICER – provides a public venue in which the evidence on the effectiveness and value of health care services can be discussed with the input of all stakeholders. The New England CEPAC seeks to help patients, clinicians, insurers, and policymakers interpret and use evidence to improve the quality and value of health care.

The New England CEPAC Panel is an independent committee of medical evidence experts from across New England, with a mix of practicing clinicians, methodologists, and leaders in patient engagement and advocacy. All Panel members meet strict conflict of interest guidelines and are convened to discuss the evidence summarized in ICER reports and vote on the comparative clinical effectiveness and value of medical interventions. More information about the New England CEPAC is available at https://icer.org/who-we-are/people/independent-appraisal-committees/new-england-cepac/.

The findings contained within this report are current as of the date of publication. Readers should be aware that new evidence may emerge following the publication of this report that could potentially influence the results. ICER may revisit its analyses in a formal update to this report in the future.

The economic models used in ICER reports are intended to compare the clinical outcomes, expected costs, and cost effectiveness of different care pathways for broad groups of patients. Model results therefore represent average findings across patients and should not be presumed to represent the clinical or cost outcomes for any specific patient. In addition, data inputs to ICER models often come from clinical trials; patients in these trials may differ in real-world practice settings.

In the development of this report, ICER's researchers consulted with several clinical experts, patients, manufacturers, and other stakeholders. The following experts provided input that helped guide the ICER team as we shaped our scope and report. It is possible that expert reviewers may not have had the opportunity to review all portions of this draft report. None of these individuals is responsible for the final contents of this report, nor should it be assumed that they support any part of it. The report should be viewed as attributable solely to the ICER team and its affiliated researchers.

For a complete list of stakeholders from whom we requested input, please visit: https://icer.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/ICER_Beta-Thalassemia_Stakeholder-List_122321.pdf

Expert Reviewers

Monica Bhatia, MD

Associate Professor of Pediatrics and Director, Pediatric Stem Cell Transplant Program Columbia University Medical Center

No relevant conflicts of interest to disclose, defined as more than \$10,000 in health care company stock or more than \$5,000 in honoraria or consultancies during the previous year from health care manufacturers or insurers.

Maria Domenica Cappellini, MD Honorary Professor of Internal Medicine University of Milan

No relevant conflicts of interest to disclose, defined as more than \$10,000 in health care company stock or more than \$5,000 in honoraria or consultancies during the previous year from health care manufacturers or insurers.

Paul DiLorenzo, PhD

President

Thalassemia Support Foundation

No relevant conflicts of interest to disclose, defined as more than \$10,000 in health care company stock or more than \$5,000 in honoraria or consultancies during the previous year from health care manufacturers or insurers.

Sujit Sheth, MD Professor Weill Cornell Medicine

Dr. Sheth has received salary or other payments for services such as consulting fees or honoraria in excess of \$5,000 from bluebird bio, Bristol Myers Squibb (BMS), and Agios. Dr. Sheth has also received manufacturer support of research in thalassemia clinical trials conducted by BMS, Agios, Forma, and Imara.

Table of Contents

Executive SummaryES1
1. Background1
2. Patient and Caregiver Perspectives
3. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness5
3.1. Methods Overview5
Scope of Review
Evidence Base5
3.2. Results
Clinical Benefits7
Harms10
Subgroup Analyses and Heterogeneity11
Uncertainty and Controversies11
3.3. Summary and Comment12
4. Long-Term Cost Effectiveness15
4.1. Methods Overview15
4.2. Key Model Assumptions and Inputs17
4.3. Results
Base-Case Results20
Sensitivity Analyses
Scenario Analyses24
Threshold Analyses26
Model Validation28
Uncertainty and Controversies28
4.4 Summary and Comment
5. Contextual Considerations and Potential Other Benefits
6. Health Benefit Price Benchmarks32
7. Potential Budget Impact
7.1. Overview of Key Assumptions33
7.2 Results

References	35
A. Background: Supplemental Information	A1
A1. Definitions	A1
A2. Potential Cost-Saving Measures in Beta Thalassemia	A2
A3. Research, Development, and Manufacturing Costs	A2
B. Patient Perspectives: Supplemental Information	B1
B1. Methods	B1
C. Clinical Guidelines	C1
Thalassaemia International Federation ²²	C1
D. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness: Supplemental Information	D1
D1. Detailed Methods	D1
PICOTS	D1
Data Sources and Searches	D7
Study Selection	D10
Data Extraction and Quality Assessment	D10
Assessment of Level of Certainty in Evidence	D10
Assessment of Bias	D10
Data Synthesis and Statistical Analyses	D11
D2. Evidence Tables	D12
D3. Ongoing Studies	D25
D4. Previous Systematic Reviews and Technology Assessments	D26
National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE, England)	D26
Haute Autorité de Santé (HAS, France)	D26
Federal Joint Committee (G-BA, Germany)	D26
Systematic Literature Review	D27
E. Long-Term Cost-Effectiveness: Supplemental Information	E1
E1. Detailed Methods	E1
Treatment Strategies	E2
Target Population	E2
E2. Model Inputs and Assumptions	E4

Model Inputs	E4
Model Inputs	E6
Model Outcomes	E15
Description of evLY Calculations	E15
E3. Results	E16
Base-Case Results	E16
E4. Sensitivity Analyses	E17
E5. Scenario Analyses	E21
E6. Heterogeneity and Subgroups	E22
E7. Model Validation	E23
Prior Economic Models	E24
F. Potential Budget Impact: Supplemental Information	F1
F1. Methods	F1
F2. Results	F2

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations Used in this Report

AHRQ BLA	Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality Biologics License Application
DEXA	dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry
	deciliter
	equal value line year
EQ-5D-3L VAS	EuroQol visual analog scale
EQ-5D-Y VAS	Eurodol Visual analog scale-youth
FACT-G	Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-Bone Marrow Transplant
σ	gram
б Hh	bemoglohin
на	human leukocyte antigen
HSC	hematonoietic stem cells
ност	hematopoletic stem-cell transplantation
	liver iron concentration
ITE	long-term follow-up
MCID	minimal clinically important difference
Mg	milligram
MRI	magnetic resonance imaging
n	number
N	total number
NC	not calculated
NR	not reported
PDUFA	Prescription Drug User Fee Act
PedsQL	Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory
pRBC	packed red blood cells
QALY	quality adjusted life year
SCD	sickle cell disease
SD	standard deviation
SE	standard error
SF-36 MCS	Short Form-36 Health Survey Mental Component Summary
SF-36 PCS	Short Form-36 Health Survey Physical Component Summary
SMR	standardized mortality ratio
SOC	standard of care
TD	transfusion dependent
TDT	transfusion-dependent beta-thalassemia
ТІ	transfusion independence
TIF	Thalassemia International Federation

Executive Summary

Beta-thalassemia is a rare blood disorder with the potential for high morbidity and mortality when treated sub optimally. Transfusion dependent thalassemia (TDT), the most severe form of this disease, is managed through lifelong regular blood transfusions and iron chelation therapy to avert the consequences of iron overload. There are likely between 1,000 – 1,500 people in the US living with TDT,^{1,2} but there are estimated to be about 1.25 million carriers of the genetic defect that is responsible for thalassemia. Until recently, the only curative option for TDT was allogenic hematopoietic (blood) stem cell transplantation (HSCT) from a matched donor, ideally a sibling. HSCT requires high doses of conditioning chemotherapy and places the recipient at risk of complications associated with HSCT itself (e.g., graft vs. host disease) and finding an HSCT match is difficult as fewer than 25% of patients have access to a suitable match.

Although life expectancy has increased with improved treatments, patients with TDT still report decreased quality of life due to the impact on physical and mental health.^{3,4} Patients and clinicians reported to us that living with severe forms of beta thalassemia requires being "tethered to the health care system" and often to a specific region near a medical center that can provide thalassemia care. Some patients receive transfusions as often as every two weeks, and nearly all patients plan their lives around transfusions. Regular transfusions and phlebotomy can be technically challenging in young children, causing stress in patients and caregivers.

Betibeglogene autotemcel (beti-cel), manufactured by bluebird bio, is a gene therapy that provides an additional potentially curative option for patients with TDT. Beti-cel is manufactured *ex vivo* utilizing an individual's own hematopoietic stem cells (HSCs). A lentiviral vector (BB305) is then used to add functional copies of the β -globin gene (β^{A-T87Q}) to patients' HSCs. The modified HSCs (beti-cel) are then infused intravenously back into the individual following conditioning chemotherapy. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) accepted bluebird bio's Biologics License Application (BLA) of beti-cel for priority review on November 22, 2021, and the revised PDUFA date is set for August 19, 2022 (originally May 20, 2022). Public statements made by the manufacturer suggest that beti-cel pricing will be consistent with an outcome-based payment plan of five equal yearly payments totaling \$2.1 million for individuals who achieve and maintain transfusion independence.

The systematic review yielded five studies of beti-cel: two Phase I/II trials, two Phase III trials, and one long-term follow-up cohort study of trial participants. Each of the four trials were open-label single arm designs. A manufacturing change occurred between the Phase I/II and Phase III trials; therefore, we gave greater emphasis to the results from the Phase III trials.

Transfusion independence in the Phase III trials was achieved in 89% of the patients who received beti-cel.⁵ Transfusion independence among patients treated in Phase I/II and Phase III trials was

sustained over a median length of follow-up of 42 months (range 23-87). However, this duration is not long enough to remove uncertainty regarding the durability of effect over a longer time period. Beti-cel infusion is associated with mild side effects, but few patients experienced serious adverse events, and no deaths were reported. Uncertainty remains about the degree of risk of beti-cel infusion in real-world practice, and there are known risks associated with myeloablative conditioning.⁶ Because of the questions about these risks and the durability of the clinical benefit, we judge that the evidence demonstrates that beti-cel is superior overall to the current standard of care, but the magnitude of that overall net health benefit is less certain, ranging between incremental to substantial (B+). Interestingly, we heard from many stakeholders, including patients with TDT and their families, that even if beti-cel proves to be a durable cure with an excellent safety profile, there are likely to be many patients who choose to continue their current management with transfusion and chelation.

Table ES1. Evidence Ratings

Treatment	Comparator	Evidence Rating
Betibeglogene autotemcel (beti-cel)	Standard of Care	B+

We performed cost-effectiveness analyses comparing beti-cel to the standard of care with co-base cases from the health care system and modified societal perspectives. Payment for beti-cel was assumed to be through five equal yearly payments in an outcomes-based contract that pays only for success, totaling \$2.1 million for those patients who achieve and maintain transfusion independence through year five.

Treatment	Comparator	Cost per QALY Gained	Cost per evLY Gained	Cost per Life Year Gained	Cost per TD Year Averted
Health Care System Perspective					
Beti-cel	SOC	\$92,200	\$89,500	\$167,600	\$24,700
Modified Societal Perspective					
Beti-cel	SOC	\$33,600	\$33,300	\$61,300	\$9 <i>,</i> 000

evLY: equal value life year, QALY: quality adjusted life year, SOC: standard of care, TD: transfusion dependent

Results were robust across numerous sensitivity and scenario analyses. The manufacturer has suggested publicly that beti-cel will be priced based on its clinical value to patients only rather than its ability to offset costs of current therapy.⁷ In a scenario analysis mirroring this approach, when half of the cost offsets from beti-cel treatment are retained by the health system, cost-effectiveness estimates exceeded \$200,000/evLY gained, demonstrating that cost offsets have a substantial impact on the cost effectiveness of this treatment.

In summary, despite remaining uncertainties, the evidence suggests that beti-cel provides net health benefits to patients with TDT, and given the high annual costs of standard care, traditional cost-effectiveness modeling finds that this new treatment meets commonly accepted value

thresholds at a cumulative price of \$2.1 million if paid through an outcomes-based contract for patients with sustained transfusion independence.

1. Background

Beta thalassemia is an inherited blood disorder caused by a genetic mutation of the *HBB* gene that leads to reduced or absent synthesis of the β -globin proteins of hemoglobin, components of red blood cells responsible for carrying oxygen. When β -globin is markedly reduced or absent, it leads to ineffective production and increased destruction of red blood cells, manifesting in clinically significant anemia.

Beta thalassemia is an autosomal recessive disorder. Individuals who carry a mutation in only one copy of the HBB gene are generally asymptomatic or only have mild anemia (beta thalassemia minor or trait, Hb>10.0 g/dL). It is estimated that 1.5% of the global population carries at least one defective copy of the HBB gene, with certain geographic areas having a higher local prevalence – primarily in the Mediterranean, Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia.⁸⁻¹⁰ However, if both copies of the *HBB* gene have a mutation, there will be a reduction or absence of β -globin. The degree to which β -globin is reduced depends on the specific mutation and how many genes are affected: $\beta 0/\beta 0$ (completely absent β -globin), $\beta + /\beta +$ (some β -globin production, severity depends on mutation), or β +/ β 0 (one gene copy produces some β -globin, the other produces none). Patients with completely absent β -globin have a more severe clinical course, typically presenting in the first six to 24 months of life with severe anemia, failure to thrive, and end organ damage; prompt initiation of transfusion therapy is required to prevent early mortality.^{11,12} Conversely, patients with some β -globin production have variable clinical presentations with some patients depending on routine transfusions to maintain health and quality of life, while others might have mild symptoms or only receive transfusions in times of stress (e.g., pregnancy, infection, surgery). Historically, patients with absent β -globin were considered to have thalassemia major and those with reduced β -globin were considered to have thalassemia intermedia, but it is clinically preferable to classify thalassemia based on clinical severity and transfusion requirements regardless of the underlying genotype. The 2021 Guidelines published by the Thalassaemia International Federation (TIF) classify beta thalassemia phenotypically into two main groups based: transfusion dependent thalassemia (TDT) and non-transfusion dependent thalassemia (NTDT).¹²

Lifelong, regular blood transfusions and removal of excess iron through chelation are the mainstays of treatment for patients with TDT. Routine transfusions, typically every two to five weeks, aim to keep hemoglobin at a level that suppresses the body's production of its own (abnormal) hemoglobin. However, as excess iron accumulates as a consequence of repeated transfusion and increased gut absorption, chelation is critical for treating and preventing complications from iron overload (e.g., pulmonary hypertension, liver dysfunction, cardiac manifestations), the main source of morbidity and mortality in TDT. In addition, patients with TDT also contend with other disease-related complications such as problems with growth and development, diabetes and other endocrine abnormalities, and fertility and pregnancy-related concerns. There is also the ongoing

risk of transfusion-related side effects and infections, although the latter are rare with modern blood screening procedures. Standard of care may also include treatment with luspatercept-aamt (Reblozyl®, Acceleron Pharma Inc. and Bristol Myers Squibb/Celgene Corp.), a biologic that can enhance erythropoietic maturation and differentiation resulting in increased red cell production, thereby reducing transfusion burden in some patients.

Hematopoietic stem cell transplantation (HSCT) is currently the only curative treatment for TDT. Ideally, HSCT is performed in children younger than 14 years of age with a human leukocyte antigen (HLA)-matched sibling donor. In such candidates, the cure rate is over 90% with a 4% risk of mortality. The cure rate decreases in older patients, those with extensive iron toxicity, and those without a matched donor.¹³ Lack of compatible donors is a central limitation of initiating HSCT, as fewer than 25% of patients have compatible related or unrelated donors.¹⁴

Betibeglogene autotemcel ("beti-cel", bluebird bio), previously marketed in Europe under the brand name ZyntegloTM, is an emerging, potentially curative, gene therapy for beta thalassemia. Beti-cel uses a lentivirus vector to insert a functioning version of the *HBB* gene into the patient's own blood cells. This is accomplished by retrieving stem cells from the patient's blood, engineering them outside of the body, and then transplanting cells with functioning *HBB* genes back into the body. The person must receive chemotherapy to prepare the bone marrow to receive the modified cells and to produce new red cells with normal β -globin/hemoglobin. The FDA accepted bluebird bio's Biologics License Application (BLA) of beti-cel for priority review on November 22, 2021, and the revised PDUFA date is set for August 19, 2022 (original May 20, 2022).

Intervention	Mechanism of Action	Delivery Route	Prescribing Information
Betibeglogene autotemcel (beti-cel β)	Ex vivo genetic modification of autologous HSC using a lentiviral vector encoding the β^{A-T87Q} -globin gene	Intravenous infusion following myeloablative conditioning with chemotherapy	To be determined

Table 1.1. Interventions of Interest

HSC: hematopoietic stem cells

2. Patient and Caregiver Perspectives

Although life expectancy has increased with improved treatments, patients with TDT still report decreased quality of life due to the impact on physical and mental health.^{3,4} Patients and clinicians reported that living with severe forms of beta thalassemia requires being "tethered to the health care system" and often to a geographic area with a medical center that can provide thalassemia care. Management of the condition has been described as a part-time job for patients and their caregivers. Patients plan their lives around transfusions, disrupting their ability to travel, take vacations, work, and study. Some patients receive transfusions as often as every two weeks, in addition to regular MRI and DEXA imaging, monitoring of laboratory values, and visits to clinical specialists (e.g., endocrinologists, cardiologists). Regular transfusions and phlebotomy can be technically challenging in young children, causing stress in patients and caregivers. Some patients require semi-permanent catheters (i.e., ports) to facilitate regular transfusions, which carry a risk of infection. Patients and their caregivers also spend hours managing administrative aspects of their condition, such as calling doctors' offices and navigating insurance policies. Patients and caregivers emphasized how quality of life is also markedly impacted by other manifestations of thalassemia (e.g., diabetes, problems with growth or development). Infertility, including as a consequence of HSCT, was highlighted as a particular concern among all groups of stakeholders, including adult patients, caregivers of children, and clinicians.

Social determinants of health may be important drivers of quality of life in patients with TDT. Patients reported needing to have high health literacy and access to major medical centers specializing in thalassemia care. Patients also reported requiring significant flexibility in their work and home lives in order to attend medical appointments and receive frequent transfusions. Patients with "white collar" jobs that allow for remote work may have advantages over patients with more physically demanding jobs (e.g., still being able to work during periods of extreme fatigue between transfusions). Among patients with TDT, women, older age, and those with more disease complications or side effects from management of iron overload (i.e., chelation therapy), on average report lower health-related quality of life.¹⁵ This was echoed in the sentiment of the patients we spoke to – their views about their own quality of life over time related to how wellmanaged their thalassemia was, with a particular emphasis on iron status/overload. Adherence to iron chelation is associated with better quality of life but using iron chelation therapy as indicated is a problem for many patients.¹⁶ We heard from patients and caregivers that optimizing iron chelation therapy was challenging, particularly during adolescence. The lack of immediate symptomatic decline ("feeling normal for a period of time"), route of administration and dosing, and the side effects of chelation therapy itself were all cited as reasons that someone might not adhere to iron chelation therapy.

While patients we spoke to expressed optimism about the promise of gene therapy, they also raised concerns about barriers to accessing this treatment (e.g., insurance coverage/pre-authorization, needing to live near particular medical centers, eligibility criteria). For instance, some patients highlighted that they had difficulty accessing luspatercept, an adjunct to standard care, even though their treating clinicians recommended it. Overall, patients reported that they will carefully weigh costs, insurance coverage, duration of clinical benefit, and risks once gene therapy becomes available.

We met with representatives from the Thalassaemia International Federation (TIF), the largest global thalassemia advocacy group, about the perspective of patients and caregivers. In a 2020 report by TIF, the majority of survey respondents with thalassemia demonstrated a positive attitude towards gene therapy with a significant proportion interested in gene therapy for themselves or their children. In developed countries (including the US), however, 29% of patients reported that they would accept gene therapy, while the remaining patients reported they would not accept gene therapy (24%) or were uncertain (47.2%). This mirrors what we heard from patients in our stakeholder interviews. While there was general enthusiasm toward the possibility of curing beta thalassemia, some patients whose condition is well-managed with current standard of care thought they might be reluctant to modify their treatment regimen because beti-cel has only been evaluated in small numbers of patients and treatment requires chemotherapy and hospitalization. Other adults we spoke with expressed a strong interest in gene therapy and thought they would pursue it if eligible. We spoke with caregivers of adult children living with TDT and also parents of a child who had undergone a sibling matched HSCT. These caregivers thought there would be a strong interest in gene therapy among parents with young children. When probed about what a cure for TDT would mean, one participant told us "time... and you just can't put a price on that."

In sum, our stakeholder conversations highlight significant enthusiasm and cautious optimism for a gene therapy cure for TDT.

3. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness

3.1. Methods Overview

Procedures for the systematic literature review assessing the evidence on betibeglogene autotemcel (beti-cel) for the treatment of TDT are described in <u>Supplement Section D1</u>. A research protocol is published on <u>Open Science Framework</u> and registered with PROSPERO (CRD42022300138).

Scope of Review

We reviewed the clinical effectiveness of beti-cel versus standard of care for the treatment of TDT. We also intended to compare beti-cel to HSCT but did not identify any evidence directly comparing the two therapies. We sought evidence on patient-important outcomes, including transfusion independence, manifestations of iron overload, health-related quality of life, and adverse events. The full scope of the review is described in <u>Supplement Section D1</u>.

Evidence Base

The evidence informing this review was derived from five studies of beti-cel: two Phase I/II trials, two Phase III trials, and one long-term follow-up study of trial participants. Additional safety data were reviewed from a Phase I/II trial of lovotibeglogene autotemcel in sickle cell disease because it was developed and tested together with beti-cel in early phase trials; both therapies insert a functional human beta-globin gene into the patient's hematopoietic stem cells.

Beti-cel was first evaluated in two Phase I/II trials ("HGB-204" and "HGB-205") in patients with TDT of any genotype.¹⁷ These trials collectively enrolled 27 patients who were 35 years of age or younger, with lower age limits of 12 and 5 years in the HGB-204 and HGB-205 trials, respectively. Patients were considered to be transfusion-dependent if they received at least eight transfusions per year, or at least 100 mL/kg of body weight of packed red cells per year, in the two years prior to enrollment.^{18,19} Following the Phase I/II trials, the manufacturing process was modified to enhance transduction efficiency in the Phase III trials; due to this change, the Phase III trials are the primary focus of this review.

NorthStar-2 ("HGB-207") and NorthStar-3 ("HGB-212") were identically designed single-arm Phase III trials in patients with TDT with either a non- β 0/ β 0 genotype in NorthStar-2 or a β 0/ β 0 genotype in NorthStar-3. Eligible patients were up to 50 years of age, received at least eight transfusions per year for the prior two years, or at least 100 mL/kg/year of packed red blood cells, and were HSCT eligible. Patients were excluded if they had a previous HSCT or had a known or available HLA-matched family donor.^{20,21}

A total of 41 patients in the Phase III trials received beti-cel. These patients had a median age of 13 years, received 11 to 40 transfusions per year prior to enrollment, and had baseline liver iron concentrations above normal levels.²² There were no apparent clinically important differences in patient characteristics between the two Phase III trials. Additional baseline characteristics can be found in Table 3.1 and <u>Supplement Table D6</u>. Patients remained in the trial for 24 months post-infusion, after which they could enroll in a long-term follow-up study; follow-up is still ongoing for some patients.

A total of 57 patients from Phase I/II and Phase III trials have enrolled in the long-term follow-up study ("LTF-303"), which will follow patients up to fifteen years. Patients have been followed for a median of 42 months and a maximum of 87 months to date.¹⁷ Detailed descriptions of all included trials can be found in <u>Supplement Table D4</u>.

Trial	Study Design	Population	Key Baseline Characteristics
	Single arm, multi-site,		Age, median (range): 20 (12-35)
	Phase I/II trial	TDT of any	Transfusions per year, median (range): NR
HGB-204	N = 18	genotype	Previous splenectomy, n (%): 6 (33)
	Follow-up: 2 years		LIC ⁺ , mg/g, median (range): NR
	Single arm, multi-site,		Age, median (range): 18 (16-19)
HCB-205*	Phase I/II trial	TDT of any	Transfusions per year, median (range): NR
HGB-205	N = 4	genotype	Previous splenectomy, n (%): 3 (75)
	Follow-up: 2 years		LIC ⁺ , mg/g, median (range): NR
	Singlo arm multi sito		Age, median (range): 15 (4-34)
NorthStar 2	Phase III trial N = 23 Follow-up: 2 years	TDT with a	Transfusions per year, median (range): 16
(HGB-207)		non-β0/β0	(11.5-37)
		genotype	Previous splenectomy, n (%): 4 (17)
			LIC⁺, mg/g , median (range): 5.3 (1-41)
	Single arm multi-site		Age, median (range): 15 (4-33)
Single arm, multi-site, TDT wi		TDT with a	Transfusions per year, median (range): 17.5 (11-
	N – 19	β0/β0	39.5)
(100-212)	Follow-up: 2 years	genotype	Previous splenectomy, n (%): 3 (20)
	Tollow-up. 2 years		LIC ⁺ , mg/g, median (range): 5.8 (1.2-13.2)
	Phase IV multi contor	тот	Age, median (range): 15 (5-34)
175 202	N = 35 Follow-up: 7 years	noviously	Transfusions per year, median (range): 17.5
		infused with	(11-39.5)
FildSe III			Previous splenectomy, n (%): 7 (20)
		Deti-tel	LIC ⁺ , mg/g, median (range): 4.9 (1-41)

Table 3.1. Overview of Included Studies²³⁻²⁵

g: gram, LIC: liver iron concentration, LTF: long-term follow-up, mg: milligram, n: number, N: total number, NR: not reported, SCD: sickle-cell disease, TDT: transfusion-dependent beta thalassemia

* Patients with TDT and SCD were included in HGB-205; only patients with TDT are presented here

+ Normal liver iron concentration reference <1.8

‡ NorthStar 3 data comes from 15 of 18 total infused patients at 14.4 median months of follow-up

3.2. Results

Clinical Benefits

Transfusion Independence

A total of 63 patients from the Phase I/II and Phase III trials have received an infusion of beticel.^{5,17,23} All patients had successful neutrophil and platelet engraftment, which occurred after a median of 26 (range 13-39) days for neutrophil engraftment and a median of 46 (range 13-94) days for platelet engraftment in the Phase III trials.^{5,17} Patients spent a median of 44 (range 29-92) days in the hospital from conditioning through discharge. See Table 3.2 for additional information regarding engraftment outcomes.

The primary efficacy endpoint in the Phase III NorthStar-2 and -3 trials was transfusion independence (TI), defined as a weighted average hemoglobin \geq 9 g/dL without any packed red blood cell (pRBC) transfusions for a continuous period of \geq 12 months, and beginning within 12 to 24 months of beti-cel infusion.^{20,21}

Among participants from the NorthStar-2 and -3 trials with sufficient follow-up to evaluate the primary endpoint, 32 (89%) have achieved TI (Table 3.2).⁵ Over a median follow-up of 42 months (range 23-87) across Phase I/II and Phase 3 studies, no patients who have achieved TI have lost TI.²⁶ Average hemoglobin during the period of TI (weighted by time), was also used as a measure to assess treatment efficacy. The median hemoglobin levels presented in NorthStar-2 and -3 remained stable over at least 24 months of follow-up (Supplement Table D9).⁵

	Pooled Phase I/II	Pooled Phase III
Follow-Up, median months (range)	42 (23-87)	
Enrolled, N	23	43
Infused, N	22	41
Successful Engraftment, n (%)	22/22 (100)	40/40 ⁺ (100)
Time to Neutrophil Engraftment, median days	HGB-204: 18.5 (14-30)	
(range)	HGB-205: 16.5 (14-29)	25.5 (15-59)
Time to Platelet Engraftment, median days	HGB-204: 39.5 (19-191)	16 (12 04)
(range)	HGB-205: 23 (20-26)	40 (15-94)
Duration of Hospitalization [§] , median days (range)	40 (27-69) [‡]	44 (29-92)
Transfusion Independence, n/N (%)	14/22 (64)	32/36* (89)
Hb level during TI, g/dL, median (range)	10.3 (8.2-13.7)	11.5 (9.3-13.7)

Table 3.2. Key Trial Results^{17,26-28}

dL: deciliter, g: grams, Hb: hemoglobin, n: number, N: overall number, TI: transfusion independence

* Evaluable patients (i.e., surpassed at least 12-months of follow-up)

+ Patients with >1.3 months of follow-up were evaluated for engraftment

‡ Reported for HGB-204 only

§ From conditioning through discharge

Quality of Life

Patients in NorthStar-2 and -3 who achieved TI were assessed for improvements in health-related quality of life (HRQoL) using several instruments: Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory (PedsQL), EuroQol visual analog scales (EQ-5D-Y and EQ-5D-3L VAS), Short Form-36 Health Survey: Physical and Mental Component Summaries (SF-36 PCS and SF-36 MCS), and Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-Bone Marrow Transplant and -General (FACT-BMT and FACT-G). All instruments assessed physical, emotional, and social functioning, with higher scores indicating better HRQoL.⁵ The instruments are described in more detail in <u>Supplement Section A1</u>.

Adolescents evaluated with the EQ-5D-Y VAS and adults evaluated with the EQ-5D-3L VAS instruments had high mean HRQoL at baseline (scores of 81 and 85 respectively out of a best possible score of 100), which improved 24 months after receiving beti-cel (see Table 3.3). On the PedsQL scale, pediatric and adolescent patients experienced a mean improvement of 10 points 24 months after receiving beti-cel, which exceeded the minimally clinically important difference (MCID) of 4.36. Small improvements were reported in adults assessed with the SF-36 PCS, SF-36 MCS, FACT-BMT, and FACT-G instruments.⁵ More details on HRQoL instruments and outcomes can be found in Table 3.3 and <u>Supplement Table D14</u>.

Instrument (score range)	Baseline, mean score (SE)	Month 24, mean score (SE)	Change from Baseline to Month 24	Instrument MCID
EQ-5D-Y VAS (0-100)	81.4 (SD: 19.2)	92.4 (SD: 6.0)	11.0	NC
EQ-5D-3L VAS (0-100)	85.2 (SD: 10.5)	94.2 (SD: 4.8)	9.0	NC
PedsQL (0-100)	77.4 (3.6)	87.1 (1.8)	9.7	4.36
SF-36 PCS (0-100)	53.8 (1.4)	55.7 (1.4)	1.9	2.0
SF-36 MCS (0-100)	51.0 (1.7)	53.4 (2.3)	2.4	2.0
FACT-BMT (0-196)	125.8 (3.4)	128.9 (3.0)	3.1	NC
FACT-G (0-108)	94.2 (2.6)	95.8 (2.1)	1.6	NC

Table 3.3. HRQoL Outcomes⁵

EQ-5D-3L VAS: EuroQol visual analog scale, EQ-5D-Y VAS: EuroQol visual analog scale-youth, FACT-BMT: Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-Bone Marrow, FACT-G: Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-General, MCID: minimal clinically important difference, NC: not calculated, PedsQL: Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory, SD: standard deviation, SE: standard error, SF-36 MCS: Short Form-36 Health Survey Mental Component Summary, SF-36 PCS: Short Form-36 Health Survey Physical Component Summary

Changes in Chelation Therapy and Iron Overload

Patients discontinued iron chelation therapy 7 to 25 days prior to myeloablative conditioning and could resume treatment approximately three months after beti-cel infusion. The decision to resume or discontinue therapy was at the discretion of patients and their physicians, rather than achievement of reference levels of iron indicators. Among 25 participants from the Phase III trials who achieved TI, 18 (72%) discontinued iron chelation after a median of 29 months (range 6-47 months) post-infusion; of these patients, 11 never resumed chelation and 7 restarted and stopped

at a later time.²³ A similar proportion (67%) of patients who reached transfusion independence during the Phase I/II trials also discontinued iron chelation.

Indicators of iron overload improved following beti-cel infusion (Table 3.4, <u>Supplement Tables D8-10</u>), although some patients who restarted and then stopped chelation in the long-term follow-up study experienced increases in iron levels. It is uncertain how iron fluctuations affected decisions to stop or restart chelation therapy.

Overall, serum ferritin levels declined by approximately 50% during the first two years of follow-up in the Phase III NorthStar-2 trial; longer-term follow-up of four patients from the Phase I/II HGB-205 trial suggested iron levels continued to fall, with two patients reaching a normal level by 48 months of follow-up and a third reaching a normal level by 60 months.^{25,28} In this latter study, one of the four participants stopped chelation after 17 months, while the remainder continued chelation and phlebotomies.²⁸

Declines in liver iron concentrations accrued over time. While there was no appreciable decline in any participant of the Phase III NorthStar-2 trial during the first 24 months of follow-up, three patients for whom longer follow-up data were available reached the normal range by 36 months, and over a median of 44 months follow-up, the median concentration of liver iron in patients who achieved TI fell from a baseline of 5.3 mg/g of dry weight (range 1.0-41.0) to 4.5 mg/g (range 1.4-20.3).²⁵

Myocardial iron levels did not change over the first 24 months of follow-up in the NorthStar-2 trial, and remained within the normal range for all but one patient whose T2*-weighted MRI measurement decreased below the normal range of >20 msec at 12 and 24 months.²⁵ Results from the Phase I/II HGB-205 trial were only reported between 24 and 72 months of follow-up, but remained within the normal range during that time.²⁸

	Baseline	24 Months	36 Months
Median serum ferritin level, ng/ml	1826 (349 - 5978)	862 (94-8443)	698 (126 - 2134)
(range)	n=20	n=18	n=8
Median liver iron concentration, mg/g	5.1 (1.0 - 41.0)	4.9 (1.4 - 20.3)	2.0 (1.4 - 2.2)
of dry weight (range)	n=20	n=17	n=3
Median T2*-weighted MRI measurement of myocardial iron, msec (range)	36.5 (21 - 57) n=20	35.1 (15 - 47) n=17	33.5 (29 - 41) n=7

Table 3.4. Iron Status in the Phase III NorthStar-2 (HGB-207) Trial²⁵

g: gram, mg: milligram, ml: milliliter, MRI: magnetic resonance imaging, n: number assessed, ng: nanogram Liver iron concentration reference <1.8

Myocardial iron reference >20

Serum ferritin reference range 30-400

Harms

All patients who underwent myeloablative conditioning and beti-cel infusion during the Phase III trial NorthStar-2 trial experienced at least one adverse event (AE).²⁵ There have been no deaths in patients with TDT across the beti-cel clinical development program, although serious AEs have been reported. Serious AEs were deemed likely related to myeloablative conditioning and included: five cases of veno-occlusive liver disease, stomatitis, thrombocytopenia, neutropenia, febrile neutropenia, pyrexia, and heart failure (Table 3.5).

Grade \geq 3 AEs were common, with 96% of trial participants experiencing grade \geq 3 thrombocytopenia and \geq 50% experiencing grade \geq 3 neutropenia, anemia, leukopenia, and/or stomatitis (Table 3.5). Other commonly reported grade \geq 3 AEs included febrile neutropenia, epistaxis, decreased appetite, and mucosal inflammation.

AEs deemed by investigators to be possibly related to beti-cel include two cases of grade 3 thrombocytopenia but were otherwise mild (three cases of abdominal pain, and one case each of leukopenia, neutropenia, mild thrombocytopenia, tachycardia, and pain in an extremity).

	Serious Adverse Events	Grade ≥3 Adverse Events
	n/N (%)	n/N (%)
Veno-occlusive liver disease	5/42 (12)	3/34 (9)
Pyrexia	4/38 (11)	4/23 (17)
Stomatitis	2/41 (5)	23/42 (55)
Thrombocytopenia	3/41 (7)	22/23 (96)
Neutropenia	2/41 (5)	18/23 (78)
Anemia	NR	14/23 (61)
Leukopenia	NR	13/23 (57)
Lymphopenia	NR	2/23 (9)
Febrile Neutropenia	2/41 (5)	17/38 (45)
Congestive cardiac failure	1/15 (7)	NR
Epistaxis	NR	5/23 (22)
Decreased appetite	NR	6/38 (16)
Pharyngeal inflammation	NR	4/38 (11)
Mucosal inflammation	NR	3/15 (20)

Table 3.5. Pooled Safety Data from Clinical Trials of Beti-cel^{*23-25}

n: number, N: total number, NR: not reported

*Safety data are still emerging on beti-cel. Data reported in this table were pooled from a combination of publications and conference abstracts and should be interpreted with caution

Oncogenesis and Malignancies

Insertional oncogenesis has been identified as a potential risk with transgene integration. There has been no evidence of insertional oncogenesis and no malignancies in the TDT trials of beti-cel.

However, cases of myelodysplastic syndrome (MDS) and acute myeloid leukemia (AML) have been reported in gene therapy trials that use a lentiviral vector to treat other conditions. An early-phase trial of lovotibeglogene autotemcel in patients with sickle cell disease reported one case of MDS and one case of acute myeloid leukemia (AML); the MDS diagnosis was subsequently revised to transfusion-dependent anemia and the European Medicines Agency judged that the viral vector was unlikely to be the cause of either case.^{29,30} However, three cases of MDS have also been reported in patients with cerebral adrenoleukodystrophy treated with elivaldogene autotemcel; at least one case is considered to have been mediated by the lentiviral vector insertion.³¹

Fertility

Trial participants were offered fertility preservation (sperm or testicular tissue banking for males or oocyte aspiration following ovarian stimulation and cryopreservation for females) at the discretion of the patient, their legal guardian, and the investigator.²⁵ During the long-term follow-up study, two male patients, one of whom underwent fertility preservation, reported healthy births.²⁶ There was one case of gonadotropic insufficiency, one ectopic pregnancy, and one fetal death that resulted from a spontaneous miscarriage that occurred after at least two years of follow-up.

Subgroup Analyses and Heterogeneity

The Phase III trials of beti-cel evaluated non- $\beta 0/\beta 0$ TDT (NorthStar-2) and $\beta 0/\beta 0$ TDT (NorthStar-3) patients. NorthStar-2 reported transfusion independence in 20/22 (91%) of patients and NorthStar-3 reported transfusion independence in 6/8 (75%) of patients.^{24,25}

Pooled analysis of NorthStar-2 & -3 phase III trials evaluated transfusion independence by age groups of: <12, \geq 12 - <18, and >18. Transfusion independence was achieved by 9/11 (81%) of patients in the <12 subgroup, 10/10 (100%) of patients in the \geq 12 - <18 subgroup, and 11/13 (85%) of patients in the >18 subgroup.³²

We were not able to draw conclusions about heterogeneity of treatment effect by genotype or age due to small sample size.

Uncertainty and Controversies

As discussed in ICER's <u>Value Assessment Framework Modifications for Ultra-Rare Diseases</u>, there are important challenges to generating high quality evidence for emerging treatments of ultra-rare diseases. The small sample sizes of the trials of beti-cel creates uncertainty around the estimates of some of the patient-important outcomes, particularly adverse events. Given the magnitude of the benefit (e.g., proportion of patients achieving transfusion independence) consistently observed across the trials, there is high certainty that beti-cel is successful in treating TDT. There is however much more uncertainty around significant harms such as myelodysplastic events and even

mortality. Some serious harms are likely rare occurrences and as such may not be observed in small trials. Although no deaths were observed in any of the trials, the risks associated with myeloablative chemotherapy confer a non-zero risk of mortality. Other adverse events such as infertility may require more than a decade to assess. Lastly, adverse events often occur more frequently when a therapy is used outside the careful monitoring of a clinical trial.

Two patients with sickle cell disease who were treated with a product nearly identical to beti-cel had serious bone marrow events, including one case of leukemia. However, patients with sickle cell disease are felt by some experts to be at higher risk of such events, both at baseline and after myeloablative conditioning, than patients with TDT. Further examination of the events in sickle cell disease did not establish evidence of insertional oncogenesis. However, the mechanism of action of beti-cel via a lentiviral vector could theoretically introduce the risk of malignancy through this mechanism. Although no events were noted in any of the trials, additional real-world data may be required to fully assess this risk.

In addition to small sample, the length of follow-up translates into uncertainty of the durability of treatment effect. To date, no trial participants that became transfusion independent have reverted to becoming transfusion dependent. The first trial participants have now completed approximately seven years of follow-up, yet others are only one year out from receiving beti-cel. Long-term follow-up (>15 years) is required to establish precision around durability of the treatment effect.

The trials of beti-cel lacked a control group for reasons of both ethics and feasibility. There is therefore no head-to-head comparator with the only curative treatment – allogenic HSCT. As such sibling matched allogenic HSCT is likely to remain the first line treatment, with beti-cel indicated in patients that do not have sibling matched donor as an option. Clinician experts with whom we spoke expressed an interest in knowing if gene therapy should be the first line curative option (over sibling matched allogenic HSCT), but this is a shortcoming of available trial data given a lack of direct comparison to HSCT.

3.3. Summary and Comment

An explanation of the ICER Evidence Rating Matrix (Figure 3.1) is provided in the <u>Supplement</u>. As discussed elsewhere in the report, ICER acknowledges that generating high-quality evidence for emerging treatments for ultra-rare diseases can be challenging.

Figure 3.1. ICER Evidence Rating Matrix



I = "Insufficient" - Any situation in which the level of certainty in the evidence is low

Comparative Clinical Effectiveness

In this review, we set out to compare the clinical effectiveness and safety of beti-cel to standard of care for individuals with transfusion-dependent beta-thalassemia.

We evaluated data from two open-label, single-arm Phase III trials on successful neutrophil and platelet engraftment, transfusion independence, hemoglobin levels during transfusion independence, and indicators of iron overload. Safety outcomes that were evaluated included hepatic veno-occlusive disease, pyrexia, stomatitis, thrombocytopenia, neutropenia, anemia, and leukopenia. Evidence for efficacy outcomes was significant enough to suggest that the gene therapy provides a substantial net health benefit. Given the novelty of gene therapies and lack of significant long-term evidence, we are unable to assess the long-term durability of treatment effect for this intended cure. Safety outcomes have been consistent with those generally expected from myeloablative conditioning and there have been no deaths in the trials. Although there have been

no oncogenic events in beti-cel trials, there have been some occurrences in other gene therapy trials utilizing lentiviral vectors. Therefore, it is not possible to dismiss concern about the possibility of oncogenic events with beti-cel. We judge beti-cel to be incremental or better with moderate certainty of a small or substantial net health benefit ("B+") for this comparison.

Additionally, given what we heard from many stakeholders, including patients with TDT and their families, it is likely that even if beti-cel is a durable cure and has an excellent safety profile, there are likely to be a proportion of patients who choose to continue their current management with transfusion and chelation.

Table 3.6. Evidence Rating

Treatment	Comparator	Evidence Rating
Betibeglogene autotemcel (beti-cel)	Standard of Care	B+

4.1. Methods Overview

The primary aim of this analysis was to estimate the cost effectiveness of beti-cel for the treatment of TDT. We developed a de novo decision analytic model for this evaluation, informed by key clinical trials and prior relevant economic models.³³ Our analysis reports results from a health care system perspective (i.e., focus on direct medical care costs only) and a modified societal perspective (i.e., including patient productivity and/or education impacts, caregiver productivity impacts, caregiver quality of life). The modified societal perspective was included as a co-base case given that patient and caregiver productivity costs are high relative to direct health care costs, and the impact of beti-cel treatment on these costs (i.e., by achieving transfusion independence) is substantial.

The model focused on an intention-to-treat analysis, with a hypothetical cohort of patients living with TDT being treated with beti-cel and, separately, with SOC alone entering the model. Model cycle length was one year, based on what was observed in prior published economic models,^{34,35} with the first yearly cycle representing a decision tree when patients would receive the beti-cel intervention (Figure 4.1). After the first-year decision tree, the Markov model consisted of health states including transfusion dependent (TD), transfusion independent (TI), and dead (Figure 4.2). Patients entering the Markov model in the TI health state were based on clinical trial data (i.e., hemoglobin [Hb] ≥9g/dL without any red blood cell [RBC] transfusions for a continuous period of ≥12 months after infusion) and remaining in that state was defined by no requirement for RBC transfusions. A cohort of patients transitioned between states during annual cycles over a lifetime time horizon, modeling patients from treatment initiation until death. All patients who achieved transfusion independence from beti-cel in the decision tree entered the Markov model in that state. No additional patients transitioned from the TD to TI health state for the remainder of the model and retransplant with beti-cel was not modeled. Patients reverting to the TD health state remained in that state until death. Cost effectiveness was presented across different time horizons to gain further understanding of the relationship between durability, time horizon, and cost effectiveness. Costs and outcomes were discounted at 3% per year.

Patients remained in the model until death. The model tracked iron overload and corresponding complications within each of the living health states. In addition to all-cause mortality, probability of death varied based on transfusion health state (i.e., standardized mortality ratio for TD and TI) and iron overload complications.

Cost effectiveness was estimated using the incremental cost-effectiveness ratios (cost per life year, QALY, and evLY gained), with incremental analyses comparing beti-cel to SOC alone. We also present a cost per transfusion independent year gained.

Beti-cel met the criteria for the ICER Value Framework adaptations for high-impact "single and short-term therapies" (SST) and for treatments of serious, ultra-rare conditions as outlined in our Revised Background and Scoping Document. We have assessed beti-cel under these framework adaptations which include additional scenario analyses such as optimistic and conservative scenarios regarding the benefit of treatment with beti-cel, a 50/50 shared savings analysis, and a cost-offset cap scenario. Additional detail regarding these scenarios is provided in Section 4.3.





Figure 4.2. Model Structure – Markov Model



4.2. Key Model Assumptions and Inputs

Our model includes several key assumptions stated in Table 4.1. Additional assumptions are found in <u>Supplement Table E2.1</u>.

Table 4.1	Key Mode	el Assumptions
-----------	----------	----------------

Assumption	Rationale
Real world cohort study sources were used to	Larger sample sizes were available from cohort
characterize the model cohort.	studies and experts suggested wider possible age
	bands will consider beti-cel therapy, if available.
The baseline distribution of iron overload risk	Manufacturer-submitted data and longitudinal
categories was consistent between beti-cel and	cohort studies suggest no strong evidence of
SOC arms. Patients entering the model in the	increases in the proportion of iron overload
transfusion dependent health state retained this	severity over time. A five-year iron normalization
distribution of iron overload for the duration of	period was deemed reasonable based on data
the model. Patients entering the model in the	suggesting that the median time to achieve
transfusion independent health state progressed	target ferritin levels (<300ng/mL or <500ng/mL)
through an iron normalization period of five years	for individuals with baseline ferritin levels of
for cardiac iron, liver iron, and serum ferritin	≥2500ng/mL was 64 months and 65 months,
where a disutility aligned with the TD state was	respectively. ³⁶ Finally, after a normalization

Assumption	Rationale
applied. At the end of the iron normalization	period, evidence suggests serum ferritin may
period, patients aged 2 to 11 years of age were	remain above the reference range. This risk is
considered at no risk of complications and	likely to vary by age, and thus, we assigned "low
patients ≥12 years were considered at "low risk"	risk" of complications rather than zero risk for
of complications.	patients aged ≥12 years. ^{25,37}
Complications modeled included cardiac, liver,	Cardiac, liver and endocrine complications are
diabetes, and hypogonadism. Annualized risks	primary comorbidities resulting from high iron
were derived from real world evidence and	associated with beta thalassemia. ^{12,25}
contingent upon baseline iron levels.	
The base case risk of death from beti-cel infusion	Experts suggested that mortality seen with
was 1.4% and tested in sensitivity and scenario	autologous HSCT would be the best proxy for
analyses.	what may be expected with beti-cel in clinical
	practice. Literature-based estimates for acute
	risk of death from autologous HSCT was found to
	be 2.8%; ³⁸ however, this estimate was derived
	from a population with a more severe disease.
	Input from clinical experts suggested that acute
	risk of death from beti-cel for TDT is likely to be
	1-2%. Consequently, an estimate of 1.4% was
	deemed a reasonable estimate based on the
	available evidence and clinical expert opinion.
	We explored alternate assumptions in sensitivity
	and scenario analyses.
At year seven 0.271% of patients reverted to the	The long-term durability of beti-cel treatment
ID health state (with half the baseline frequency	effect is unknown. I rial data suggest that all
of transfusions per year) and continued at a rate	patients who have achieved 11 from beti-cel have
of 0.271% per year. This rate of reversion	remained II; nowever, these data are based on a
resulted in approximately 10% of patients	limited number of patients (n=32 in Phase III
reverting to TD by the end of the lifetime time	trials) and limited duration of time (7 years of
norizon.	data for three patients receiving beti-cel). ²⁰ We
	neard from an expert in gene therapy that it
	would be theoretically possible for patients to
	revert to TD if the population of infused stem
	cells that were not genetically modified became
	cionally dominant; it was estimated that over a
	incline post-treatment, approximately 10% of
	patients would revert to TD. Other expert
	this was evaluated in a secondria analysis
Percentage of patients adherent to chalation	Fuidence suggested that adherence to chelation
therapy was dependent on the type of cholator	therapy varies by type of chalater (2% for
used and did impact the cost of treatment. No	nationts taking combination therapy to 220/ for
impact on treatment effectiveness or nationt	patients taking combination therapy to 25% 101
initiation in the annual concentration of the second secon	adherence to chelation therapy was expected to
100% adherent but remain within a range of	he intermittent and not substantially affect
good adherence (e.g. 95%) Adherence less than	natient outcomes given the assumption (above)
good adherence (e.g., 95%). Adherence less than	patient outcomes given the assumption (above)

Assumption	Rationale
100% is meant to represent the duration of time	that iron overload status remains constant for TD
where the chelation prescription is not filled by	patients.
the patient.	

HSCT: hematopoietic stem cell transplant, SOC: standard of care, TD: transfusion dependent, TI: transfusion independent

Key model inputs are described in Table 4.2. The population of focus for the economic evaluation included patients with TDT and a mean age of 22.2 years (45.0% between 2 and 17 years old with an average age of nine years old in this subset) in the base-case analysis. The patient characteristics that informed the model's base-case cohort were primarily informed by the Thalassemia Longitudinal Cohort (TLC) study. To explore the impact of alternate baseline population characteristics, we conducted a scenario analysis using data from Phase III beti-cel trials.

Transfusion independence was the primary measure of clinical efficacy and was achieved by 32/36 (89%) of the patient population. Beti-cel is currently under regulatory review in the US and therefore does not have a published price. The anticipated acquisition cost of beti-cel (\$2.1 million US) was based on a published press release estimate shared by the manufacturer of beti-cel.⁷ This cost is based on a single intravenous infusion of at least $5.0 \times 106 \text{ CD34} + \text{ cells/kg}^{40}$ and was modeled in the base case using a five-year payment plan consistent with what manufacturer and other researchers used in a peer-reviewed cost-effectiveness article.³³ The first-year cost of the payment plan was \$420,000 US and each of the subsequent four years costs \$420,000 if patients achieve and maintain transfusion independence.

Parameter	Input	Source		
Transfusion Independence, n/N (%)	32/36 (89)	Data on file ⁴⁰		
Rick of Dooth in First Yoor	1 49/	Jantunen et al., 2006 ³⁸		
Risk of Death III First fear	1.4%	(Assumptions)		
SMR for TD Health State	3.9	Kansal et al., 2021 ³³		
SMR for TI Health State	1.25	Kansal et al., 2021 ³³		
Mean Number of Transfusions/Year				
< 18 years	14.05	Marketscan and		
	14.95	Kansal et al., 2021 ³³		
> 19 years	16.1	Marketscan and		
2 10 years		Kansal et al., 2021 ³³		
Iron Overload, Risk of Complications				
Cardiac Complications*, low/	0 0022 /0 0177 /NA	NERI ⁴¹ and Kansal et		
moderate/high	0.0023/0.0177/NA	al., 2021 ³³		
Liver Complicationst low/moderate/high	0/0/0 0108	Marketscan and		
Liver Complications, low/ moderate/high	0/0/0.0198	Kansal et al., 2021 ³³		
PR of TD Diabator	8 0 2 0	Ang et al., 2014 ⁴²		
	0.323	(Assumptions)		

Table 4.2. Key Model Inputs

Parameter	Input	Source
BB of TD Hypogonadism	2 202	Ang et al., 2014 ⁴²
	2.202	(Assumptions)
Disutility Values		
TD Health State	-0.22 (age ≥16 years)	Shah et al., 2021 ³⁹
	-0.18 (age <16 years)	(Assumptions)
TI Health State	0.02	Kansal et al., 2021 ³³
TI Health State	-0.02	(Assumption)
Bet-cel Infusion (one year)	-0.31	Matza et al., 202143
Complications from Iron Overload - Cardiac	-0.03	Seyedifar et al., 201544
Complications from Iron Overload - Liver	-0.03	Seyedifar et al., 2015 ⁴⁴
Complications from Iron Overload -	-0.04	Sovedifar et al 201544
Diabetes	-0.04	Seyeunal et al., 2015
Complications from Iron Overload -	-0.04	Sovedifar et al 201544
Hypogonadism	-0.04	Seyeunal et al., 2015
Caregiver (Patient ≤26 years)	-0.03	Shah et al., 2021 ³⁹
	\$2.1 Million (with five yearly	
Cost of Beti-cel	payments conditioned on	Kansal et al., 2021 ³³
	treatment success)	

NA: not available, RR: relative risk, SMR: standardized mortality ratio, TD: transfusion dependent, TI: transfusion independent

* low iron, >20 ms; moderate iron, 10–20 ms; high iron, <10 ms

+ low iron, <7 mg/g; moderate iron, 7−15 mg/g; high iron, \ge 15 mg/g

Detail on all inputs used in the model, along with their respective reference, can be found in <u>Supplement E</u>.

4.3. Results

Base-Case Results

The total discounted costs, TD years, QALYs, life years and evLYs over the lifetime time horizon for the health care system perspective and modified societal perspective are detailed in Table 4.3. Beti-cel transplant incurred additional costs but resulted in fewer transfusion dependent years and more QALYs, life years, and evLYs. Additional results (undiscounted and disaggregated) are presented in <u>Supplement E3</u>.

Treatment	Treatment Cost*	Transfusion and Chelation Costs†	Total Cost	TD Years	QALYs	Life Years	evLYs
Health Care	System Perspe	ctive					
Beti-cel	\$1,890,000	\$230,000	\$2,730,000	3.07	19.68	24.88	19.84
SOC		\$1,820,000	\$2,260,000	22.07	14.59	22.07	14.59
Modified Societal Perspective							
Beti-cel	\$1,890,000	\$230,000	\$2,910,000	3. 07	19.59	24.88	19.75
SOC		\$1,820,000	\$2,740,000	22.07	14.47	22.07	14.47

Table 4.3. Results for the Base Case for Beti-cel Compared to SOC

evLY: equal value life year, QALY: quality adjusted life years, SOC: standard of care, TD: transfusion dependent * Only includes beti-cel acquisition cost (i.e., excludes workup, preparation, transplant, post-transplant monitoring and normalization period costs).

⁺ Only includes transfusion costs and chelation acquisition costs (i.e., excludes chelation administration and monitoring costs).

Table 4.4 presents the incremental cost-effectiveness ratios from the base-case analysis (for the health care system perspective and modified societal perspective), which includes estimates for the incremental cost per QALY gained, incremental cost per life year gained, incremental cost per evLY gained, and incremental cost per transfusion dependent year averted.

Table 4.4. Incremental Cost-Effectiveness Ratios for the Base Case

Treatment	Comparator	Cost per QALY Gained	Cost per evLY Gained	Cost per Life Year Gained	Cost per TD Year Averted
Health Care System Perspective					
Beti-cel	SOC	\$92,200	\$89,500	\$167,600	\$24,700
Modified Societal Perspective					
Beti-cel	SOC	\$33,600	\$33,300	\$61,300	\$9,000

evLY: equal value life year, QALY: quality adjusted life years, SOC: standard of care, TD: transfusion dependent

Sensitivity Analyses

To demonstrate the effects of uncertainty on both costs and health outcomes, we varied input parameters using available measures of parameter uncertainty (i.e., standard errors where available or reasonable ranges) to evaluate changes in findings.

We conducted one-way sensitivity analyses to vary one input parameter at a time across its plausible range for the health care system and the modified societal perspective. Figure 4.3 below presents this information graphically by way of a tornado diagram for the health care system perspective. <u>Supplement E4.1</u> details the inputs and results for each input included in the tornado diagram. From the one-way sensitivity analyses, we found that results were most sensitive to the cost of transfusion and chelation therapy and mean starting age of the cohort. Other influential parameters included the duration of iron normalization period post-beti-cel transplant, characteristics of the TD health state (i.e., SMR, disutility, probability of cardiac complications), and

the durability of beti-cel. <u>Supplement Figure E4.1</u> and <u>Supplement Table E4.2</u>, illustrate a tornado diagram and results for each input included in the tornado diagram, respectively, from the modified societal perspective.



Figure 4.3. Tornado Diagram (Health Care System Perspective)

SMR: standardized mortality ratio, TD: transfusion dependent, QALY: quality-adjusted life year

A probabilistic sensitivity analysis was conducted to vary all inputs with noted uncertainty simultaneously. Tables 4.5 presents the percent of iterations that were beneath thresholds of \$50,000, \$100,000, \$150,000, and \$200,000 per QALY gained for both the health care system perspective and the modified societal perspective. Additional results from the PSA can be found in the <u>Supplement Tables E4.3</u> and <u>E4.4</u> and <u>Figures E4.2</u> and <u>E4.3</u>. <u>Supplement Table E4.5</u> presents the percent of iterations that were beneath thresholds of \$50,000, \$100,000, \$150,000, and \$200,000 per evLY gained for both the health care system perspective and the modified societal perspective

\$50,000 per QALY Gained	\$100,000 per QALY Gained	\$150,000 per QALY Gained	\$200,000 per QALY Gained			
Health Care System Perspective						
21%	51%	85%	98%			
Modified Societal Perspective						
60%	91%	100%	100%			
0	\$50,000 per QALY Gained ective 21% ctive 60%	\$50,000 per QALY Gained \$100,000 per QALY Gained vective 21% 51% 21% 51% 51% ctive 60% 91%	\$50,000 per QALY Gained \$100,000 per QALY Gained \$150,000 per QALY Gained vective 21% 51% 85% ctive 60% 91% 100%			

Table 4.5. Probabilistic Sensitivity Analysis Cost per QALY Gained Results: Beti-cel versus SOC

SOC: standard of care, QALY: quality adjusted life year

Scenario Analyses

We conducted numerous scenario analyses to assess the robustness of the results across alternative model assumptions and in accordance with the modifications to the ICER value framework for ultra-rare diseases and single and short-term therapies. We include the details and results of scenario analyses below, including: the optimistic and conservative benefit scenario, a 50/50 shared savings scenario, a cost-offset cap scenario, and under a fixed one-time up-front payment for beti-cel. Additional scenario analyses including an analysis based on Phase III trial baseline patient characteristics and for alternate time horizons (i.e., 5 year and 10 year) are presented in <u>Supplement E5</u>. Lower (i.e., more favorable) cost-effectiveness estimates were found when baseline patient characteristics were based on trial data. Higher (i.e., less favorable) cost-effectiveness estimates were found for shorter time horizons.

Scenario Analysis 1: Optimistic and Conservative Benefit Scenarios

Optimistic and conservative assumptions regarding the benefit of treatment with beti-cel were performed to reflect the uncertainty in the clinical data (e.g., deaths from infusion, percentage of patients achieving transfusion independence, and maintenance of transfusion independence). Details are provided in Table 4.6 below. Cost-effectiveness estimates for the conservative scenario were less favorable, increasing above \$100,000 per additional QALY/evLY from a health care system perspective. Under the optimistic scenario results remained below \$100,000 per additional QALY/evLY. From the modified societal perspective, the conservative scenario resulted in costs per
additional QALY/evLY of slightly above a \$50,000 threshold, and under the optimistic scenario results were below a \$50,000 per additional QALY/evLY threshold. Detailed results are presented in Table 4.7.

Tab	le 4.6	Assump	otions for	Optimistic and	d Conservative Sco	enarios

	Base Case	Optimistic Scenario	Conservative Scenario
Deaths from beti-cel infusion, %	1.4%	0%	2.8%
Patients achieving transfusion independence, %	88.9%	90.2%	88.9%
Durability of treatment effect and % of	7 years, 0.271%	Lifetime 0%	7 years, 0.581%
patients reverting to TD	per year	Lifetiffe, 076	per year
Number of transfusions per year for	7.5 (< 18 years)	ΝΑ	14.95 (< 18 years)
patients reverting to TD	8.0 (≥ 18 years)	INA	16.1 (≥ 18 years)

NA: not applicable, TD: transfusion dependence

Table 4.7. Scenario Analysis Results for the	e Optimistic and Conservative Benefit Scenarios
----------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------

Scenario	Comparator	Cost per QALY Gained	Cost per evLY Gained	Cost per Life Year Gained	Cost per TD year averted
Health Care Sy	stem Perspectiv	ve			
Base Case	SOC	\$92,200	\$89 <i>,</i> 500	\$167,600	\$24,700
Optimistic	SOC	\$85 <i>,</i> 800	\$82,900	\$138,300	\$23,600
Conservative	SOC	\$113,900	\$110,700	\$236,500	\$29,100
Modified Societal Perspective					
Base Case	SOC	\$33,600	\$33,300	\$61,300	\$9,000
Optimistic	SOC	\$29,700	\$29,200	\$48,000	\$8,000
Conservative	SOC	\$53,700	\$53,500	\$112,100	\$13,800

evLY: equal value life year, QALY: quality adjusted life year, SOC: standard of care, TD: transfusion dependent

Scenario Analysis 2: 50/50 shared savings scenario

A 50/50 shared savings scenario analysis was undertaken in which 50% of lifetime health care and non-health care (for the modified societal perspective) cost offsets from beti-cel are assigned to the health care system instead of being assigned entirely to the treatment. Results are presented in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8. Scenario Analysis Results For the 50/50 Shared Savings Scenario

Treatment	Comparator	Cost per QALY Gained	Cost per evLY Gained	Cost per Life Year Gained	Cost per TD Year Averted	
Health Care System Perspective						
Beti-cel	SOC	\$236,900	\$229,800	\$430,600	\$63,500	
Modified Societal Perspective						
Beti-cel	SOC	\$206,600	\$204,900	\$377,300	\$55,700	

evLY: equal value life year, QALY: quality adjusted life year, SOC: standard of care, TD: transfusion dependent

Scenario Analysis 3: Cost-offset cap scenario

A cost-offset cap scenario analysis was undertaken in which health care and non-health care (for the modified societal perspective) cost offsets generated by beti-cel are capped at \$150,000 per year but are otherwise assigned entirely to the treatment. Cost offsets did not exceed \$150,000 in any modeled year; therefore, results are aligned with the base-case findings.

Scenario Analysis 4: Fixed one-time payment of beti-cel.

An alternate payment arrangement scenario analysis was undertaken in which the full cost of beticel was paid at the time of transplant (i.e., Year 1 in the model). Results are presented in Table 4.9.

 Table 4.9. Scenario Analysis Results for Alternate Payment Arrangement Scenario

Comparator	Cost per QALY Gained	Cost per evLY Gained	Cost per Life Year Gained	Cost per TD Year Averted		
Health Care System Perspective						
SOC	\$133,900	\$129,900	\$243,500	\$35,900		
Modified Societal Perspective						
SOC	\$75,100	\$74,500	\$137,200	\$20,200		
	Comparator tem Perspective SOC cal Perspective SOC	ComparatorCost per QALY Gainedtem PerspectiveSOC\$133,900tal PerspectiveSOC\$75,100	ComparatorCost per QALY GainedCost per evLY Gainedtem PerspectiveSOC\$133,900\$129,900tal PerspectiveSOC\$75,100\$74,500	ComparatorCost per QALY GainedCost per evLY GainedCost per Life Year Gainedtem PerspectiveSOC\$133,900\$129,900\$243,500tal PerspectiveSOC\$75,100\$74,500\$137,200		

evLY: equal value life year, QALY: quality adjusted life year, SOC: standard of care, TD: transfusion dependent

Threshold Analyses

Threshold analyses were conducted to identify at what price beti-cel would meet certain costeffectiveness thresholds. Tables 4.10 and 4.11 present the findings from these threshold analyses for the health care system perspective and modified societal perspective using outcomes of both the QALY and evLY, respectively. The prices presented in this table do not include costs for beti-cel workup and preparation, transplant, post-transplant monitoring or post-transplant normalization period costs and therefore represent threshold prices for beti-cel acquisition alone.

As is the case for all threshold analyses, a treatment's price that would meet a threshold is a factor of two main components: health gains and potential cost savings. When taking the health care system perspective and the evLY gained measure of changes in health, if we assigned \$0 to the acquisition cost of beti-cel rather than \$2.1 million, the resulting evLY gains remain as in the base

case (5.25 evLY gained) while the potential cost savings are \$1.42 million. At a threshold of \$100,000 per evLY gained, the health care system perspective evLY-based threshold-based draft price of \$2.16 million (assuming 5-year payment plan and guarantees on payments after year one only for those who succeed) suggests that 27% of this draft threshold-based price is due to the health gains and the remaining 73% of the draft threshold-based price is due to potential cost savings mainly from reduced transfusions and chelation treatment.

Likewise, when taking the modified societal perspective and the evLY gained measure of changes in health, if we assigned \$0 to the acquisition cost of beti-cel, the resulting evLY gains remain as in the base case (5.16 evLY gained) while the potential cost savings are \$1.72 million. At a threshold of \$100,000 per evLY gained, the societal perspective evLY-based threshold-based draft price of \$2.49 million (assuming the same 5-year payment plan as in the health care system perspective) suggests that 23% of this draft threshold-based price is due to the health gains, and the remaining 77% of the draft threshold-based price is due to the potential cost savings.

	Net Price per Unit*	Unit Price* to Achieve \$50,000 per QALY Gained	Unit Price* to Achieve \$100,000 per QALY Gained	Unit Price* to Achieve \$150,000 per QALY Gained	Unit Price* to Achieve \$200,000 per QALY Gained
Health Care System	m Perspective				
Beti-cel	\$2,100,000	\$1,860,000	\$2,140,000	\$2,420,000	\$2,710,000
Modified Societal Perspective					
Beti-cel	\$2,100,000	\$2,190,000	\$2,470,000	\$2,760,000	\$3,040,000

Table 4.10. QALY-Based Threshold Analysis Results

*Excludes beti-cel workup and preparation, transplant, post-transplant monitoring or post-transplant normalization period costs. Unit price represents the full acquisition cost of beti-cel per patient. Based on the 5year payment plan proposed by the manufacturer, the expected value of beti-cel accounting for patients who do not achieve transfusion independence is \$1.87 million (and therefore the full \$2.1 million cost of beti-cel is not paid on behalf of all patients).

Table 4.11. evLY-Based	Threshold	Analysis	Results
------------------------	-----------	----------	---------

	Net Price per Unit*	Unit Price* to Achieve \$50,000 per evLY Gained	Unit Price* to Achieve \$100,000 per evLY Gained	Unit Price* to Achieve \$150,000 per evLY Gained	Unit Price* to Achieve \$200,000 per evLY Gained
Health Care System	m Perspective				
Beti-cel	\$2,100,000	\$1,860,000	\$2,160,000	\$2,450,000	\$2,740,000
Modified Societal Perspective					
Beti-cel	\$2,100,000	\$2,200,000	\$2,490,000	\$2,780,000	\$3,080,000

*Excludes beti-cel workup and preparation, transplant, post-transplant monitoring or post-transplant normalization period costs

Model Validation

We used several approaches to validate the model. First, we provided preliminary model structure, methods and assumptions to manufacturers, patient groups, and clinical experts. Based on feedback from these groups, we refined data inputs used in the model. Second, we varied model input parameters to evaluate face validity of changes in results. We performed model verification for model calculations using internal reviewers. As part of ICER's efforts in acknowledging modeling transparency, we also share the model with the relevant manufacturers for external verification. Finally, we compared results to other cost-effectiveness models in this therapy area. In particular, we report our findings of a replication of Kansal et al.'s³³ patient-level simulation using our cohort-level model. These results are reported in <u>Supplemental Material E7</u>. The outputs from the model were validated against the trial/study data of the interventions and also any relevant observational datasets.

Uncertainty and Controversies

The population of focus for the assessment is patients living with TDT, typically defined as eight or more transfusions per year. Although this population is considered broad, there is strong overlap between a narrower population that may consider beti-cel treatment, if approved, and those who would have considered allogenic HSCT but did not have a matched donor. Like beti-cel, HSCT requires high doses of conditioning chemotherapy and likely has a non-zero risk of short-term death. Additionally, and unlike beti-cel, HSCT places the recipient at risk for graft versus host disease. As we heard from patients living with TDT and their caregivers, some patients living with TDT may not opt for beti-cel, if available and covered under their health benefit, given their preferences and their own risk-benefit tradeoffs. In short, for some people living with TDT, the risks and time invested may not be worth the potential long-run health and other benefits. One major limitation in the cost-effectiveness model is that it assumes risk neutrality in estimating the expected lifetime health gains associated with beti-cel versus standard of care. Therefore, the expected lifetime health gains summarized in this section of the report may be best thought of conditioned on this narrower subpopulation of those who

would have considered allogenic HSCT but did not have a matched donor (i.e., those that would consider the net health benefit of opting for beti-cel to be positive).

Estimating beti-cel's lifetime health outcomes and costs required assumptions and was conducted under conditions of evidence uncertainty. As shown in the one-way sensitivity analyses and supported by additional scenario analyses, the cost-effectiveness findings are sensitive to the type or mix of chelation treatment (and corresponding costs) and the mean starting age of the cohort. Other influential parameters included the normalization duration after beti-cel treatment (and corresponding risks of complications) and the durability of transfusion independence for which there is limited evidence available. Given beti-cel has yet to receive a final FDA decision, there is no known transaction price we can observe. However, public statements made by the manufacturer suggest that beti-cel pricing will be consistent with a payment plan of five equal yearly payments adding to \$2.1 million for those who achieve transfusion independence. In this model, the expected value of the \$2.1 million payment was \$1.89 million, per treated patient. We highlight that this payment plan versus charging \$1.89 million up front for all treated patients lessens the impact that a non-zero acute death risk and that the estimate of treatment failure has on the incremental cost-effectiveness findings (given limited payment for those who die or do not achieve transfusion independence).

We note that given the annualized costs of chelation and transfusions that are a part of standard of care and given opportunities for fewer complications that are associated with an increased risk of death, the population's age will have impacts on the cost effectiveness of beti-cel (with all else equal, those of younger age are associated with a lower incremental cost-effectiveness ratio). Because policy making will remain at the population level, the base-case cost-effectiveness findings and corresponding threshold-based prices presented in this report remain at the population level that average over the eligible population's age. Although we used a cohort-based model, we did account for known differences by age category in costs and outcomes. For example, we accounted for beti-cel workup costs, and transfusion and chelation costs that differ based on ages <18 and \geq 18 years by assuming that 45% of the cohort would have a mean starting age of <18 years. We also accounted for differences in the likelihood of cardiac complications following the normalization period post-beti-cel transplant by assuming that there would be no risk of cardiac complications for patients who receive beti-cel between the ages of 2 and 11 years, and a low risk for patients who receive beti-cel when older than 11 years of age. Additionally, caregiver impacts (including disutility and productivity losses) were accounted for in the model for patients up to the age of 26 years old.

As observed in the threshold-based draft price findings, the potential cost savings (rather than health gains) are responsible for the majority of the threshold-based draft price justification. The potential cost savings being a driver was also demonstrated by the changes in cost-effectiveness findings to above commonly cited thresholds when assuming a 50/50 cost-savings scenario whereby only 50% of the cost savings were assigned when estimating beti-cel's cost effectiveness.

A follow-on inquiry is whether the current standard of care achieves value for money. If standard of care does not achieve value for money (e.g., chelation therapy is overpriced for its conferred health benefits), then society may be perpetuating this lack of value for money if we were to reward a new intervention like beti-cel by attributing all the potential cost savings to its value and corresponding price. How society may break a perpetual chain of interventions that do not achieve value for money is controversial.

Finally, deliberations on the value of beti-cel may consider the closest alternative medical intervention, allogenic HSCT for those with a matched donor. Research suggests that the average cost of allogenic HSCT for those with myeloablative conditioning after 100 days was approximately \$300,000 (2013 USD).⁴⁵ Beti-cel, if approved, is an opportunity for those who would have opted for allogenic HSCT but did not have a matched donor. Although beti-cel may therefore, expand those living with TDT chance's at living independent from transfusions, deliberators may find it helpful to consider whether beti-cel is considered high value care if the beti-cel acquisition cost for treating one person living with TDT approximates the costs of six or seven allogenic HSCT procedures.

4.4 Summary and Comment

Our draft report analyses suggest that treating eligible patients living with TDT with beti-cel results in lifetime health gains and added costs when compared to standard of care alone (e.g., transfusion and chelation therapy). After discounting future costs and outcomes at three percent per year, beti-cel has an incremental cost effectiveness that approaches \$100,000 per QALY and evLY gained from the health care system perspective. Findings from the modified societal perspective that included estimates of productivity loss for patients and caregivers were below \$50,000 per QALY and evLY gained. The cost-effectiveness findings were driven by the lifetime opportunity to reduce chelation and transfusion costs (and reduce productivity costs in the modified societal perspective) while also demonstrating health gains that may be considered meaningful to those living (or caring for those living) with TDT.

5. Contextual Considerations and Potential Other Benefits

Our reviews seek to provide information on potential other benefits offered by the intervention to the individual patient, caregivers, the delivery system, other patients, or the public that was not available in the evidence base nor could be adequately estimated within the cost-effectiveness model. These elements are listed in the table below, with related information gathered from patients and other stakeholders. Following the public deliberation on this report the appraisal committee will vote on the degree to which each of these factors should affect overall judgments of long-term value for money of the intervention in this review.

Table 5.1. Contextual Considerations

Contextual Consideration	Relevant Information
Acuity of need for treatment of individual	There is a moderate risk of morbidity/ disability from
patients based on short-term risk of death	chronic iron overload.
or progression to permanent disability	
Magnitude of the lifetime impact on	Thalassemia is a lifelong chronic disease and as such,
individual patients of the condition being	there is significant lifetime impact.
treated	

Table 5.2. Potential Other Benefits or Disadvantages

Potential Other Benefit or Disadvantage	Relevant Information
Patients' ability to achieve major life goals	If patients with Thalassemia were not dependent on
related to education, work, or family life	transfusion, they would have more flexibility, time, and potential ability to achieve major life goals.
	A potential disadvantage of beti-cel compared to standard of care (e.g., transfusion, chelation) is the potential impact of myeloablative condition to impact future fertility.
Caregivers' quality of life and/or ability to	Caregivers, particularly those of young children, would
achieve major life goals related to	benefit from improved quality of life and also benefit
education, work, or family life	from increased ability to achieve major life goals.
Patients' ability to manage and sustain treatment given the complexity of regimen	Standard of care places a high burden on patients and caregivers (e.g., frequent transfusions and health care monitoring visits, daily chelation).
	Conversely, treatment with beti-cel requires patients to be hospitalized and to receive myeloablative chemotherapy.
Society's goal of reducing health inequities	Minimal impact

6. Health Benefit Price Benchmarks

ICER does not provide health benefit price benchmarks as part of draft reports because results may change with revision following receipt of public comments. We therefore caution readers against assuming that the values provided in the Threshold Prices section of this draft report will match the health benefit price benchmarks that will be presented in the next version of this Report.

7. Potential Budget Impact

7.1. Overview of Key Assumptions

Results from the cost-effectiveness model were used to estimate the potential total budgetary impact of beti-cel for patients with transfusion-dependent beta thalassemia. We used a proposed price of \$2,100,000 per treated patient to be paid over five years (and only paid by year if the patient achieved transfusion independence), the same as in the base case cost-effectiveness analysis, and the three threshold prices (at \$50,000, \$100,000, and \$150,000 per QALY) for beti-cel in our estimates of budget impact.

For this analysis, we assumed that all patients eligible for treatment with beti-cel were currently uncontrolled and therefore received treatment with standard of care. All costs were undiscounted and estimated over a five-year time horizon. This budget impact analysis included the estimated number of individuals ages 0 to 50 years with TDT in the US who would be eligible for treatment with beti-cel. Using this approach, we derived an estimate of 666 patients in the US eligible for treatment with beti-cel. Our estimate begins with prevalent cases of beta thalassemia in the US of roughly 2,100.46 From there, we assumed that about 63% of patients could be classified as having TDT arriving at approximately 1,333 patients.² Of patients who are diagnosed with transfusiondependent beta thalassemia, we assumed that 50% would be eligible for treatment with beti-cel, arriving at approximately 666 patients. Consistent with our budget impact methods, we further assumed that 20% of these 666 patients would initiate treatment in each of the five years, or approximately 133 patients per year. The aim of the potential budgetary impact analysis is to document the percentage of patients who could be treated at selected prices without crossing a potential budget impact threshold that is aligned with overall growth in the US economy. The fiveyear annualized potential budget impact threshold that should trigger policy actions to manage access and affordability is calculated to be approximately \$734 million per year for new drugs. ICER's methods for estimating potential budget impact are described in detail in the Supplement Section F.

7.2 Results

Results showed that at the proposed price of \$2.1 million per treatment course (to be paid across five years given treatment success), all eligible patients could be treated over the span of five years without crossing the ICER budget impact threshold of \$734 million per year. Similarly, all eligible patients could be treated with beti-cel without reaching the potential budget impact threshold at the three threshold prices (approximately \$1.85 million, \$2.11 million, and \$2.38 million per course of treatment). Given that we did not observe any potential budget impact findings above our

budget impact threshold, due to the small projected population size, we will not be presenting the above findings in graphical form.

The cumulative per patient budgetary impact findings assuming the proposed price for beti-cel are presented the <u>Supplement Section F</u>.

References

- CDC. Thalassemia Awareness. <u>https://www.cdc.gov/ncbddd/thalassemia/features/international-thalassemia.html</u>. Published 2020. Updated May 2020. Accessed.
- 2. Modell B, Darlison M. Global epidemiology of haemoglobin disorders and derived service indicators. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2008;86(6):480-487.
- 3. Arian M, Mirmohammadkhani M, Ghorbani R, Soleimani M. Health-related quality of life (HRQoL) in beta-thalassemia major (beta-TM) patients assessed by 36-item short form health survey (SF-36): a meta-analysis. *Qual Life Res.* 2019;28(2):321-334.
- 4. Vitrano A, Calvaruso G, Lai E, et al. The era of comparable life expectancy between thalassaemia major and intermedia: Is it time to revisit the major-intermedia dichotomy? *Br J Haematol.* 2017;176(1):124-130.
- 5. Kwiatkowski JL, Locatelli F, Walters MC, et al. Improvement in Health-Related Quality of Life Following Treatment with Betibeglogene Autotemcel in Patients with Transfusion-Dependent β-Thalassemia Enrolled in Phase 3 Studies. *Blood.* 2021;138:3085.
- 6. Leonard A, Bertaina A, Bonfim C, et al. Curative therapy for hemoglobinopathies: an International Society for Cell & Gene Therapy Stem Cell Engineering Committee review comparing outcomes, accessibility and cost of ex vivo stem cell gene therapy versus allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. *Cytotherapy.* 2022;24(3):249-261.
- 7. Walker J. Biotech Proposes Paying for Pricey Drugs by Installment. *The Wallstreet Journal* 2019.
- De Sanctis V, Kattamis C, Canatan D, et al. beta-Thalassemia Distribution in the Old World: an Ancient Disease Seen from a Historical Standpoint. *Mediterr J Hematol Infect Dis*. 2017;9(1):e2017018.
- 9. Sayani FA, Kwiatkowski JL. Increasing prevalence of thalassemia in America: Implications for primary care. *Annals of Medicine*. 2015;47(7):592-604.
- 10. Farmakis D, Giakoumis A, Angastiniotis M, Eleftheriou A. The changing epidemiology of the ageing thalassaemia populations: A position statement of the Thalassaemia International Federation. *European Journal of Haematology.* 2020;105(1):16-23.
- 11. Origa R. beta-Thalassemia. *Genet Med.* 2017;19(6):609-619.
- 12. Cappellini MD, Cohen A, Porter JB, Taher AT, Viprakasit V, eds. 2021 Guidelines for the Management of Transfusion Dependent Thalassemia (TDT), 4th edition. Thalassemia International Federation; 2021.
- 13. Angelucci E, Benz EJJ, eds. *Hematopoietic cell transplantation for transfusion-dependent thalassemia.* UpToDate; 2021. Robert S Negrin, Chao NJ, eds. UpToDate.
- 14. Angelucci E, Matthes-Martin S, Baronciani D, et al. Hematopoietic stem cell transplantation in thalassemia major and sickle cell disease: indications and management recommendations from an international expert panel. *Haematologica*. 2014;99(5):811-820.
- 15. Sobota A, Yamashita R, Xu Y, et al. Quality of life in thalassemia: a comparison of SF-36 results from the thalassemia longitudinal cohort to reported literature and the US norms. *Am J Hematol.* 2011;86(1):92-95.
- 16. Cappellini MD, Bejaoui M, Agaoglu L, et al. Prospective evaluation of patient-reported outcomes during treatment with deferasirox or deferoxamine for iron overload in patients with beta-thalassemia. *Clin Ther.* 2007;29(5):909-917.
- 17. Thompson AA, Walters MC, Kwiatkowski J, et al. Gene Therapy in Patients with Transfusion-Dependent beta-Thalassemia. *N Engl J Med.* 2018;378(16):1479-1493.

- ClinicalTrials.gov. A Study Evaluating the Safety and Efficacy of the LentiGlobin BB305 Drug Product in β-Thalassemia Major Participants. <u>https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT01745120</u>. Published 2012. Updated 2019. Accessed2022.
- ClinicalTrials.gov. A Study Evaluating the Safety and Efficacy of LentiGlobin BB305 Drug Product in β-Thalassemia Major (Also Referred to as Transfusion-dependent β-Thalassemia [TDT]) and Sickle Cell Disease. <u>https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02151526</u>. Published 2014. Updated 2020. Accessed2022.
- ClinicalTrials.gov. A Study Evaluating the Efficacy and Safety of the LentiGlobin[®] BB305 Drug Product in Subjects With Transfusion-Dependent β-Thalassemia, Who do Not Have a β0/β0 Genotype. <u>https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02906202</u>. Published 2016. Updated 2021. Accessed2022.
- ClinicalTrials.gov. A Study Evaluating the Efficacy and Safety of the LentiGlobin[®] BB305 Drug Product in Participants With Transfusion-Dependent β-Thalassemia. <u>https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03207009</u>. Published 2017. Updated 2022. Accessed2022.
- 22. Thalassaemia International Federation. 2021 Guidelines for the Management of Transfusion Dependent Thalassaemia (TDT): 4th Edition. 2021.
- 23. Thompson A, Locatelli F, Yannaki E, et al. Restoring Iron Homeostasis in Pts Who Achieved Transfusion Independence after Treatment with Betibeglogene Autotemcel Gene Therapy: Results from up to 7 Years of Follow-up. Paper presented at: Blood; 11/05, 2021.
- 24. Evangelia Yannaki, Franco Locatelli, Andreas E. Kulozik, et al. Betibeglogene autotemcel (LentiGlobin) in patients with transfusion-dependent β-thalassemia and β0/β0, β+IVS-I-110/β+IVS-I-110, or β0/β+IVS-I-110 genotypes: Updated results from the HGB-212 study. *European Hematology Association.* 2020.
- 25. Locatelli F, Thompson AA, Kwiatkowski JL, et al. Betibeglogene Autotemcel Gene Therapy for Non–β0/β0 Genotype β-Thalassemia. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2021;386(5):415-427.
- 26. Thompson AA. Restoring Iron Homeostasis in Pts Who Achieved Transfusion Independence after Treatment with Betibeglogene Autotemcel Gene Therapy: Results from up to 7 Years of Followup. Paper presented at: American Society of Hematology; December 13, 2021, 2021.
- Kwiatkowski JL, Thompson AA, Rasko JEJ, et al. Long-Term Clinical Outcomes of Lentiglobin Gene Therapy for Transfusion-Dependent β-Thalassemia in the Northstar (HGB-204) Study. *Blood*. 2019;134(Supplement_1):4628-4628.
- 28. Magrin E, Semeraro M, Hebert N, et al. Long-term outcomes of lentiviral gene therapy for the beta-hemoglobinopathies: the HGB-205 trial. *Nat Med.* 2022;28(1):81-88.
- 29. Pharmatimes. bluebird bio re-evaluates gene therapy strategy in 'untenable' European market. <u>https://www.pharmatimes.com/news/bluebird_bio_re-</u> <u>evaluates_gene_therapy_strategy_in_untenable_european_market_1374684</u>. Published 2021. Accessed February 21, 2022.
- 30. European Medicines Agency. EMA finds no evidence linking viral vector in Zynteglo to blood cancer. <u>https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/ema-finds-no-evidence-linking-viral-vector-zynteglo-blood-cancer</u>. Published 2021. Accessed February 21, 2022.
- 31. bluebird bio via businesswire. bluebird bio Announces FDA Priority Review of Biologics License Application for eli-cel Gene Therapy for Cerebral Adrenoleukodystrophy (CALD) in Patients Without a Matched Sibling Donor. <u>https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20211217005659/en/bluebird-bio-Announces-FDA-Priority-Review-of-Biologics-License-Application-for-eli-cel-Gene-Therapy-for-Cerebral-</u>

Adrenoleukodystrophy-CALD-in-Patients-Without-a-Matched-Sibling-Donor. Published 2021. Accessed February 22, 2022.

- 32. Kulozik A, Thuret, I, Kwiatkowski, JL, Thompson, AA, Porter, JBm Hongeng, S, Yannaki, E, Sauer, M, Thrasher, AJ, Lal, A, Guo, R, Liu, W, Colvin, RA< Walters, MC, Locatelli, F. EP1301: Interim results of betibeglogene autotemcel gene therapy in pediatric patients with transfusion-dependent β- thalassemia (tdt) treated in the phase 3 northstar-2 and northstar-3 studies. European Hematology Association; 2021.</p>
- 33. Kansal AR, Reifsnider OS, Brand SB, et al. Economic evaluation of betibeglogene autotemcel (Beti-cel) gene addition therapy in transfusion-dependent β-thalassemia. J Mark Access Health Policy. 2021;9(1):1922028.
- 34. John MJ, Jyani G, Jindal A, et al. Cost Effectiveness of Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation Compared with Transfusion Chelation for Treatment of Thalassemia Major. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2018;24(10):2119-2126.
- 35. Li J, Lin Y, Li X, Zhang J. Economic Evaluation of Chelation Regimens for beta-Thalassemia Major: a Systematic Review. *Mediterr J Hematol Infect Dis.* 2019;11(1):e2019036.
- 36. Aboobacker FN, Dixit G, Lakshmi KM, et al. Outcome of iron reduction therapy in exthalassemics. *PLoS One.* 2021;16(1):e0238793-e0238793.
- 37. Franco Locatelli JK, Mark Walters, Suradej Hongeng, John Rasko, Marina Cavazzana, Manfred Schmidt, Ying Chen, Richard Colvin, Alexis Thompson. Durable Clinical Outcomes Following Betibeglogene Autotemcel (BETI-CEL) Gene Therapy With Up to 6 Years of Follow-Up in Patients With Transfusion-Dependent B-Thalassemia (TDT). The 47th Annual Meeting of the European Society for Blood and Marrow Transplantation; 2021.
- 38. Jantunen E, Itälä M, Lehtinen T, et al. Early treatment-related mortality in adult autologous stem cell transplant recipients: a nation-wide survey of 1482 transplanted patients. *Eur J Haematol.* 2006;76(3):245-250.
- Shah F, Telfer P, Velangi M, et al. Routine management, healthcare resource use and patient and carer-reported outcomes of patients with transfusion-dependent β-thalassaemia in the United Kingdom: A mixed methods observational study. *eJHaem.* 2021;2(4):738-749.
- 40. bluebird bio. Data on file. 2021.
- 41. New England Research Institutes (NERI). A secondary analysis of the thalassemia longitudinal cohort data to evaluate outcomes of standard medical care for the treatment of beta-thalassemia (THAL-1698), version 1.0. February, 2018 (data on file). Published 2018. Accessed February 9, 2022.
- 42. Ang AL, Tzoulis P, Prescott E, Davis BA, Barnard M, Shah FT. History of myocardial iron loading is a strong risk factor for diabetes mellitus and hypogonadism in adults with β thalassemia major. *Eur J Haematol.* 2014;92(3):229-236.
- Matza LS, Paramore LC, Stewart KD, Karn H, Jobanputra M, Dietz AC. Health state utilities associated with treatment for transfusion-dependent β-thalassemia. *Eur J Health Econ*. 2020;21(3):397-407.
- 44. Seyedifar M, Dorkoosh FA, Hamidieh AA, et al. Health-Related Quality of Life and Health Utility Values in Beta Thalassemia Major Patients Receiving Different Types of Iron Chelators in Iran. *Int J Hematol Oncol Stem Cell Res.* 2016;10(4):224-231.
- 45. Broder MS, Quock TP, Chang E, et al. The Cost of Hematopoietic Stem-Cell Transplantation in the United States. *Am Health Drug Benefits.* 2017;10(7):366-374.
- 46. National Organization for Rare Disorders (NORD). Beta Thalassemia. <u>https://rarediseases.org/rare-diseases/thalassemia-major/</u>. Published 2018. Accessed.

- 47. Varni JW. The PedsQL Scoring Algorithm. <u>https://www.pedsql.org/score.html</u>. Published 2022. Accessed.
- 48. EuroQol Research Foundation. EQ-5D-3L User Guide 2018, Version 6.0. https://euroqol.org/publications/user-guides/. Published 2022. Updated 2021. Accessed.
- 49. Cech DJ, Martin ST. Evaluation of Function, Activity, and Participation. In: *Functional Movement Development Across the Life Span.*2012:88-104.
- 50. FACIT Group. FACIT Measures & Searchable Library. <u>https://www.facit.org/facit-measures-searchable-library</u>. Published 2021. Accessed2022.
- 51. Mayo Clinic. Hemoglobin test. <u>https://www.mayoclinic.org/tests-procedures/hemoglobin-test/about/pac-20385075#:~:text=Results,to%2015%20grams%20per%20deciliter</u>. Published 2022. Accessed.
- 52. Mayo Clinic. Ferritin test. <u>https://www.mayoclinic.org/tests-procedures/ferritin-test/about/pac-20384928#:~:text=The%20normal%20range%20for%20blood,to%20307%20micrograms%20per%20liter</u>. Published 2022. Accessed.
- 53. Choosing Wisely. Five Things Physicians and Patients Should Question. American Society for Clinical Pathology. <u>https://www.choosingwisely.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/ASCP-Choosing-Wisely-List.pdf</u>. Published 2020. Accessed.
- 54. Cook DJ, Mulrow CD, Haynes RB. Systematic reviews: synthesis of best evidence for clinical decisions. *Ann Intern Med.* 1997;126(5):376-380.
- 55. Higgins J, Thomas, J, Chandler, J, Cumpston, M, Li, T, Page, MJ, Welch, VA. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.1 (updated September 2020). <u>https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current</u>. Published 2020. Accessed.
- 56. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *PLoS Med.* 2021;18(3):e1003583.
- 57. Ollendorf DA, Pearson SD. An integrated evidence rating to frame comparative effectiveness assessments for decision makers. *Medical care*. 2010;48(6 Suppl):S145-152.
- 58. Ollendorf D, Pearson, SD. ICER Evidence Rating Matrix: A User's Guide. <u>https://icer-</u> <u>review.org/methodology/icers-methods/icer-evidence-ratingmatrix/</u>. Published 2020. Updated January 31, 2020. Accessed.
- 59. ClinicalTrials.gov. Longterm Follow-up of Subjects With Transfusion-Dependent β-Thalassemia Treated With Ex Vivo Gene Therapy. <u>https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02633943</u>.
 Published 2015. Updated 2022. Accessed2022.
- 60. ClinicalTrials.gov. A Study Evaluating the Safety and Efficacy of bb1111 in Severe Sickle Cell Disease. <u>https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02140554</u>. Published 2014. Updated 2021. Accessed2022.
- 61. Magrin E, Semeraro M, Magnani A, et al. Results from the Completed Hgb-205 Trial of Lentiglobin for β-Thalassemia and Lentiglobin for Sickle Cell Disease Gene Therapy. *Blood*. 2019;134(Supplement_1):3358-3358.
- 62. Franco Locatelli JLK, Mark C. Walters, John B. Porter, Suradej Hongeng, Evangelia Yannaki, Andreas E. Kulozik, Martin G. Sauer, Adrian J. Thrasher, Isabelle Thuret, Ashutosh Lal, Ruiting Guo, Weijian Liu, Richard A. Colvin, Alexis A. Thompson. Betibeglogene autotemcel in Patients With Transfusion-Dependent β-Thalassemia: Updated Results From HGB-207 (Northstar-2) and HGB-212 (Northstar-3). European Hematology Association. 2021.
- 63. Kanter J, Walters MC, Krishnamurti L, et al. Biologic and Clinical Efficacy of LentiGlobin for Sickle Cell Disease. *N Engl J Med.* 2022;386(7):617-628.
- 64. Evangelia Yannaki FL, Adrian J. Thrasher, John F. Tisdale, Paul J. Orchard, Christine N. Duncan, Jörn-Sven Kühl, Satiro De Oliveira, Martin G. Sauer, Andreas E. Kulozik, Suradej Hongeng, Markus

Y. Mapara, Lakshmanan Krishnamurti, Olivier Hermine, Stephane Blanche, Patrick Aubourg, Nicholas Smith, Weiliang Shi, Richard A. Colvin, Elizabeth McNeil, Jean-Antoine Ribeil, Marina Cavazzana, Mark C. Walters, David A. Williams. Safety of Autologous Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation with Gene Addition Therapy for Transfusion-Dependent β-Thalassemia, Sickle Cell Disease, and Cerebral Adrenoleukodystrophy. *Bone Marrow Transplant.* 2020;55(Suppl 1):75-76.

- 65. Badawy SM, Beg U, Liem RI, Chaudhury S, Thompson AA. A systematic review of quality of life in sickle cell disease and thalassemia after stem cell transplant or gene therapy. *Blood Adv.* 2021;5(2):570-583.
- 66. Sanders GD, Neumann PJ, Basu A, et al. Recommendations for Conduct, Methodological Practices, and Reporting of Cost-effectiveness Analyses: Second Panel on Cost-Effectiveness in Health and Medicine. *Jama*. 2016;316(10):1093-1103.
- 67. Kwiatkowski JL, Kim HY, Thompson AA, et al. Chelation use and iron burden in North American and British thalassemia patients: a report from the Thalassemia Longitudinal Cohort. *Blood.* 2012;119(12):2746-2753.
- 68. Truven Health Analytics. Characteristics and costs of transfusion-dependent thalassemia patients. Data from the marketscan commercial, medicaid and medicare databases. In:2017.
- 69. Arias E, Xu, J,. United States Life Tables. *Natl Vital Stat Rep.* 2019;68(7):1-66.
- 70. Delea TE, Sofrygin O, Thomas SK, Baladi JF, Phatak PD, Coates TD. Cost effectiveness of oncedaily oral chelation therapy with deferasirox versus infusional deferoxamine in transfusiondependent thalassaemia patients: US healthcare system perspective. *Pharmacoeconomics*. 2007;25(4):329-342.
- 71. Walters MC, Hardy K, Edwards S, et al. Pulmonary, gonadal, and central nervous system status after bone marrow transplantation for sickle cell disease. *Biology of blood and marrow transplantation : journal of the American Society for Blood and Marrow Transplantation.* 2010;16(2):263-272.
- 72. Jiang R, Janssen MFB, Pickard AS. US population norms for the EQ-5D-5L and comparison of norms from face-to-face and online samples. *Qual Life Res.* 2021;30(3):803-816.
- 73. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Health Expenditures by Age and Gender. <u>https://www.cms.gov/Research-Statistics-Data-and-Systems/Statistics-Trends-and-Reports/NationalHealthExpendData/Age-and-Gender</u>. Published 2021. Accessed.
- FINOSE. Zynteglo (autologous cd34+ cells encoding βAT87Q-globin gene).
 <u>https://www.fimea.fi/documents/160140/1454401/FINOSE+joint+assessment+report+Zynteglo</u>
 <u>+FINAL.pdf/1a1d3dc5-db79-48c8-6622-cff9b04ce088?t=1589197458993</u>. Published 2019.
 Accessed February 11, 2022.
- 75. National Institute for HEalth and Care Excellence (NICE). Appraisal consultation document: Betibeglogene autotemcel for treating transfusion-dependent beta-thalassaemia. <u>https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/gid-ta10334/documents/html-content-3</u>. Published 2021. Accessed February 11, 2022.
- National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Single Technology Appraisal: Betibeglogene autotemcel for treating transfusion-dependent beta-thalassaemia [ID968]. <u>https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/gid-ta10334/documents/committee-papers</u>. Published 2021. Accessed February 11, 2022.
- 77. European Medicines Agency (EMA). Annex I: Summary of product characteristics. <u>https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/product-information/zynteglo-epar-product-information_en-1.pdf</u>. Accessed February 11, 2022.

- 78. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Physician Fee Schedule. <u>https://www.cms.gov/medicare/physician-fee-schedule/search</u>. Published 2022. Accessed February 11, 2022.
- 79. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. 22CLABQ1. <u>https://www.cms.gov/medicaremedicare-fee-service-paymentclinicallabfeeschedclinical-</u> <u>laboratory-fee-schedule-files/22clabg1</u>. Published 2022. Accessed February 11, 2022.
- 80. Allen AM, Van Houten HK, Sangaralingham LR, Talwalkar JA, McCoy RG. Healthcare Cost and Utilization in Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: Real-World Data From a Large U.S. Claims Database. *Hepatology*. 2018;68(6):2230-2238.
- Paramore C, Levine L, Bagshaw E, Ouyang C, Kudlac A, Larkin M. Patient- and Caregiver-Reported Burden of Transfusion-Dependent β-Thalassemia Measured Using a Digital Application. *Patient*. 2021;14(2):197-208.
- 82. US Bureau of Labor statistics. May 2020 National Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates United States. <u>https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_nat.htm#00-0000</u>. Published 2020. Accessed February 11, 2022.
- 83. Pickard AS, Law EH, Jiang R, et al. United States Valuation of EQ-5D-5L Health States Using an International Protocol. *Value in health : the journal of the International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research.* 2019;22(8):931-941.
- 84. Institute for Clinical and Economic Review. 2020-2023 Value Assessment Framework. <u>https://icer-review.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/ICER_2020_2023_VAF_013120-4.pdf</u>. Published 2020. Accessed.
- 85. Pearson SD. The ICER Value Framework: Integrating Cost Effectiveness and Affordability in the Assessment of Health Care Value. *Value in health : the journal of the International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research.* 2018;21(3):258-265.

Supplemental Materials

A. Background: Supplemental Information

A1. Definitions

Transfusion Independence: Defined as having an average hemoglobin level of 9 grams per deciliter without any red blood cell transfusions for 12 or more consecutive months after beti-cel infusion.²⁵

Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory (PedsQL): Measures health-related quality of life (HRQoL) in children and adolescents over five domains of health: physical, emotional, psychosocial, social, and school functioning. Score range from 0-100 with higher scores indicating better HRQoL functioning.⁴⁷

EuroQol-3 level visual analog scale (EQ-5D-3L VAS): Measures HRQoL in adults over five dimensions: mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain/discomfort and anxiety/depression. Scores range from 0 (worst imaginable health) to 100 (best imaginable health).⁴⁸

EuroQol-youth visual analog scale (EQ-5D-Y VAS): The child-friendly version of the EQ-5D measuring the same five dimensions of health. Scores range from 0 (worst imaginable health) to 100 (best imaginable health).⁴⁸

Short Form-36 Health Survey (SF-36): Measures HRQoL in adults over eight domains of health: vitality, physical functioning, bodily pain, general health perceptions, physical role functioning, emotional role functioning, social role functioning, mental health. Scores range from 0-100 with higher scores indicating better functioning.⁴⁹

Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-General (FACT-G): Measures HRQoL in patients with cancer over four domains: physical, social, emotional, and functional well-being. Scores range from 0-108 with higher scores indicating better quality of life.⁵⁰

Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-Bone Marrow Transplant (FACT-BMT): Measures HRQoL in patients with bone marrow transplants over five domains: physical, social, emotional, and functional well-being, and an additional bone marrow transplant subscale. Scores range from 0-196 with higher scores indicating better quality of life.⁵⁰

Normal Hemoglobin Levels: Range from 11.6-15 grams per deciliter for women and 13.2-16.6 grams per deciliter for men.⁵¹

Normal Liver Iron Concentration: Defined as <1.8 mg/g dry weight.²²

Normal Ferritin Levels: Range from 11 to 307 micrograms per liter for women and 24 to 336 micrograms per liter for men.⁵²

A2. Potential Cost-Saving Measures in Beta Thalassemia

ICER includes in its reports information on wasteful or lower-value services in the same clinical area that could be reduced or eliminated to create headroom in health care budgets for higher-value innovative services (for more information, see https://icer.org/our-approach/methods-process/value-assessment-framework/). These services are ones that would not be directly affected by therapies for beta thalassemia (e.g., reduction in transfusions), as these services will be captured in the economic model. Rather, we are seeking services used in the current management of beta thalassemia beyond the potential offsets that arise from a new intervention. During stakeholder engagement and public comment periods, ICER encouraged all stakeholders to suggest services (including treatments and mechanisms of care) currently used for patients with beta thalassemia that could be reduced, eliminated, or made more efficient. No suggestions were received.

Choosing Wisely recommendations from the American Society for Clinical Pathology recommend against repeat hemoglobin electrophoresis (or equivalent) in patients who have a prior result and who do not require therapeutic intervention or monitoring of hemoglobin variant levels.⁵³

A3. Research, Development, and Manufacturing Costs

As described in ICER's modified framework for assessing value of treatments for ultra-rare diseases, ICER invited manufacturers to submit relevant information on research, development, and manufacturing costs that may impact pricing of a drug. For this report, no manufacturer submitted information on development or production costs that would be an important factor in justifying the price of their products.

B. Patient Perspectives: Supplemental Information

B1. Methods

During ICER's open input and public comment periods, we received public comment submissions from three stakeholders (two patient advocacy groups and one manufacturer) and participated in conversations with 20 key informants (three patient advocacy groups, six clinical experts, one manufacturer, one payer, one researcher, and eight individual patients). The feedback received from written input and scoping conversations helped us to discuss the impact on patients described in Chapter 2 of the evidence report.

C. Clinical Guidelines

Clinical practice guidelines for the treatment of TDT have been issued by several US-based and non-US-based organizations. The Thalassemia International Federation's (TIF) guidelines are the most comprehensive, recently updated in 2021, and referenced by many of the other organizations' guidelines, therefore a brief summary of key points of the TIF guidance is presented below.

Thalassaemia International Federation²²

In 2021, the Thalassaemia International Federation, published an update (4th edition) to their guidelines on the management of TDT.²² These guidelines outline best practices on the screening, diagnosis, treatment, and monitoring of TDT. The guidelines emphasize standards for regular transfusions and the management of iron overload, the largest source of morbidity and mortality in patients with TDT. It is recommended that patients with TDT are transfused every 2-5 weeks, maintaining pre-transfusion hemoglobin above 9.0-10.5 g/dL or up to 11.0-12.0 g/dL for patients with cardiac complications. Maintaining higher hemoglobin prevents some consequences of Thalassemia (e.g., extramedullary hematopoiesis). Regarding chelation, the guidelines state that "Chelation therapy is an effective treatment modality in improving survival, decreasing the risk of heart failure and decreasing morbidities from transfusion induced iron overload." While this statement underscores the importance of chelation therapy, it is an oversimplified statement. In fact, chelation therapy is can be quite nuanced with the "optimal chelation regime tailored for the individual and their current clinical situation."

Regarding potential curative options, the guidelines conclude that HSTC is cost-effective compared to life-long supportive therapy and that HSTC should be offered to patients with thalassemia at a young age provided that they have sibling matched donor (or highly compatible unrelated match in certain circumstances). The TIF guidelines also review active gene therapy and gene editing trials, including the trials of beti-cel by bluebird bio. They state, "among the novel gene therapies, lentiviral vector gene therapy is the most mature intervention, shown to provide clinical efficacy and safety as a one-off life-changing treatment." However, they follow by highlighting that long term safety and sustainability must still be demonstrated. At the time the guidelines were published beti-cel (marketed under the brand name Zynteglo) had received approval in Europe and thus appears in the guideline as a recommended treatment for some patients (e.g., β^+ genotype without a sibling match). While Zynteglo is no longer marketed in Europe, it stands to reason that approved gene therapy has a place in the guidelines for management of TDT.

D. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness: Supplemental Information

D1. Detailed Methods

PICOTS

Population

The population of focus for the review was patients living with TDT, typically defined as eight or more transfusions per year. While the historical categorization of beta thalassemia relied upon characterization of β -globin chain production and genotyping, more recently patients have been characterized according to their transfusion status (i.e., TDT or NTDT) as this is most closely aligned with clinical outcomes and quality of life. We considered both adult and pediatric patients with TDT without pre-specified age limits, however patients had to be clinically eligible to undergo bone marrow conditioning.

We assessed evidence on treatment for TDT for groups stratified by:

- Age
- Genotype (β0/β0 and non-β0/β0)

Interventions

The intervention of interest for this review is betibeglogene autotemcel ("beti-cel", bluebird bio) gene therapy.

Comparators

We compared the intervention to standard clinical management, including blood transfusions and iron chelation. We also sought to compare the intervention to HSCT in transplant eligible patients.

Outcomes

- Patient-important outcomes
 - O Transfusion independence
 - 0 Reduction in transfusion burden
 - o Manifestations of iron overload:
 - Cardiovascular events
 - Liver disease

- Splenomegaly and splenectomy
- Endocrine disease
- O Bone pain
- O Health-related quality of life
- o Other patient reported outcomes
- 0 Fertility
- o Mortality
- o Growth abnormalities
- O Burden of care for patients and caregivers (e.g., missed time from work)
- Transplantation success/engraftment (e.g., neutrophil count)
- O Serious adverse effects (SAEs)
- o Treatment emergent adverse effects (TEAEs)
- O Adverse events (AEs) leading to discontinuation
- Other outcomes
 - O Hemoglobin levels
 - O Iron levels (including serum ferritin, liver iron concentration, and myocardial iron deposition)
 - O Health care resource utilization

Timing

Evidence on intervention effectiveness and harms were derived from studies of any duration that meet the criteria set forth above and measure the outcomes of interest.

Settings

All relevant settings were considered, including inpatient, outpatient/clinic, office, and home settings.

Table D1. PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and	Item	Checklist item	Reported in Section					
Topic	#	Checkist item	Reported in Section					
TITLE								
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	3.1 Methods Overview					
ABSTRACT								
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	Executive Summary					
INTRODUCTION								
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	1. Background					
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	D. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness: Supplemental Information > D1. Detailed Methods > PICOTS					
METHODS								
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	D. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness: Supplemental Information > D1. Detailed Methods > PICOTS					
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organizations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	D. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness: Supplemental Information > D1. Detailed Methods > Data Sources and Searches					
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	D. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness: Supplemental Information > D1. Detailed Methods > Data Sources and Searches > Table D2 and Table D3					
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	D. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness: Supplemental Information > D1. Detailed Methods > Study Selection					
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	D. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness: Supplemental Information > D1. Detailed Methods > Data Extraction and Quality Assessment					
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g., for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	D. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness: Supplemental Information > D1. Detailed Methods > PICOTS					

Section and Topic	ltem #	Checklist item	Reported in Section	
	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g., participant and intervention 10b characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.		 2. Patient and Caregiver Perspectives D. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness: Supplemental Information > D1. Detailed Methods > PICOTS/Data Extraction and Quality Assessment 	
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	D. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness: Supplemental Information > D1. Detailed Methods > Assessment of Bias	
Effect measures	Effect measures 12 Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g., risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.		D. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness: Supplemental Information > D1. Detailed Methods > Data Synthesis and Statistical Analyses	
	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g., tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	 3. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness > 3.1 Methods Overview > Evidence Base D. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness: Supplemental Information > D1. Detailed Methods > Data Sources and Searches 	
Suptracia	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	D. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness: Supplemental Information > D1. Detailed Methods > Data Extraction and Quality Assessment	
methods	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	D. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness: Supplemental Information > D1. Detailed Methods > Data Extraction and Quality Assessment	
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta- analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	D. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness: Supplemental Information > D1. Detailed Methods > Data Extraction and Quality Assessment	
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g., subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	3. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness > 3.2 Results > Subgroup Analyses and Heterogeneity	

Section and Topic	ltem #	Checklist item	Reported in Section	
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A	
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	D. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness: Supplemental Information > D1. Detailed Methods > Assessment of Bias	
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	 Comparative Clinical Effectiveness > 3.3 Summary and Comment 	
RESULTS	I			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	D. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness: Supplemental Information > D1. Detailed Methods > Figure D1	
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A	
Study characteristics	Study Cite each included study and present its characteristics		 3. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness > 3.1 Methods Overview > Table 3.1 D. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness: Supplemental Information > D2. Evidence Tables 	
Risk of bias in studies	sk of bias in udies 18 Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.		D. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness: Supplemental Information > D1. Detailed Methods > Assessment of Bias	
Results of individual studies	Sults of dividualFor all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g., confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots		D. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness: Supplemental Information > D2. Evidence Tables	
	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarize the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	3. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness > 3.2 Results	
Results of syntheses	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g., confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	N/A	
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A	
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A	
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A	

Section and Topic	Section and Item Topic # Checklist item		Reported in Section	
Certainty of 22 evidence 22		Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	 3. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness > 3.2 Results > Uncertainty and Controversies 3. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness > 3.3 Summary and Comment 	
DISCUSSION				
	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	3. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness > 3.2 Results	
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	 Comparative Clinical Effectiveness > 3.2 Results > Uncertainty and Controversies 	
Discussion	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	3. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness > 3.2 Results > Uncertainty and Controversies	
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	 3. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness > 3.2 Results > Uncertainty and Controversies 8. Policy Recommendations (publication date: July 19, 2022) 	
OTHER INFORMA	TION			
Registration	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	 3. Comparative Clinical Effectiveness > 3.1 Methods Overview PROSPERO, David Rind, CRD42022300138 	
and protocol	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	Open Science Framework https://osf.io/9xwzb/	
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	N/A	
Support 25 Support for the or sponsors in		Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	About ICER, page iii	
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	About ICER, page iii	
Availability of data, code, and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	https://icer.org/beta-thalassemia- 2022/	

From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *PLoS Med.* 2021;18(3):e1003583.

Data Sources and Searches

Procedures for the systematic literature review assessing the evidence on beti-cel for TDT followed established best research methods.^{54,55} We conducted the review in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines.⁵⁶ The PRISMA guidelines include a checklist of 27 items.

We searched MEDLINE, EMBASE, and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials for relevant studies. Each search was limited to English-language studies of human subjects and excluded articles indexed as guidelines, letters, editorials, narrative reviews, or news items. We included abstracts from conference proceedings identified from the systematic literature search. All search strategies were generated utilizing the Population, Intervention, Comparator, and Study Design elements described above. The proposed search strategies included a combination of indexing terms (MeSH terms in MEDLINE and EMTREE terms in EMBASE), as well as free-text terms.

To supplement the database searches, we performed manual checks of the reference lists of included trials and systematic reviews and invited key stakeholders to share references germane to the scope of this project. We also supplemented our review of published studies with data from conference proceedings, , information submitted by manufacturers, and other grey literature when the evidence met ICER standards (for more information, see https://icer.org/policy-on-inclusion-of-grey-literature-in-evidence-reviews/. Where feasible and deemed necessary, we also accepted data submitted by manufacturers "in-confidence," in accordance with ICER's published guidelines on acceptance and use of such data (https://icer.org/guidelines-on-icers-acceptance-and-use-of-in-confidence-data-from-manufacturers-of-pharmaceuticals-devices-and-other-health-interventions/).

Table D2. Search Strategy of Ovid MEDLINE(R) Epub Ahead of Print, In-Process & Other Non-Indexed Citations, Ovid MEDLINE(R) Daily, Ovid MEDLINE and Versions(R) 1946 to Present and **Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials**

1	exp beta-Thalassemia/
2	exp Hemoglobins/ge
3	("beta thalass*emia" or "thalass*emia major" or ("transfusion dependent" and "thalass*emia") or ("TDT" and "thalass*emia") or "cooley* an*emia" or "mediterranean an*emia" or "homozygous beta thalass*emia" or "beta thalass*emia homozygous").ti,ab.
4	1 or 2 or 3
5	exp Gene Transfer Techniques/ or exp Gene Therapy/ or exp Genetic Vectors/ or exp Lentivirus/ge
6	"gene therapy".ti,ab.
7	5 or 6
8	4 and 7
9	("lentiglobin" or "zynteglo" or "bb305" or "bb 305" or "bb-305" or "betibeglogene autotemcel" or "beti- cel" or "beticel" or "beti cel" or "bb1111" or "bb 1111" or "bb-1111").ti,ab.
10	8 or 9
11	10 not ("address" or "autobiography" or "bibliography" or "biography" or "comment" or "congress" or "consensus development conference" or "duplicate publication" or "editorial" or "guideline" or "interview" or "lecture" or "legal case" or "legislation" or "letter" or "news" or "newspaper article" or "patient education handout" or "periodical index" or "personal narrative" or "portrait" or "practice guideline" or "review" or "video-audio media").pt.
12	11 not (animals not (humans and animals)).sh.
13	limit 12 to english language
Soarc	h ran on January 07, 2021

Search ran on January 07, 2021

Table D3. Search Strategy of Embase

1	'beta thalassemia'/exp
2	'hemoglobin'/exp
3	('beta thalass*emia' OR 'thalass*emia major' OR ('transfusion dependent' AND 'thalass*emia') OR ('TDT'
	AND 'thalass*emia') OR 'cooley* an*emia' OR 'mediterranean an*emia' OR 'homozygous beta
	thalass*emia' OR 'beta thalass*emia homozygous'):ti,ab
4	#1 OR #2 OR #3
5	'gene transfer'/exp OR 'gene vector'/exp OR 'lentivirus vector'/exp OR 'gene therapy'/exp
6	'gene therapy':ti,ab
7	#5 OR #6
8	#4 AND #7
9	('lentiglobin' OR 'zynteglo' OR 'bb305' OR 'bb 305' OR 'bb-305' OR 'betibeglogene autotemcel' OR 'beti-
	cel' OR 'beticel' OR 'beti cel' OR 'bb1111' OR 'bb 1111' OR 'bb-1111'):ti,ab
10	#8 OR #9
11	#10 NOT ('addresses' OR 'autobiography' OR 'bibliography' OR 'biography' OR 'comment' OR 'congresses'
	OR 'consensus development conference' OR 'duplicate publication' OR 'editorial' OR 'guideline' OR 'in
	vitro' OR 'interview' OR 'lecture' OR 'legal cases' OR 'legislation' OR 'letter' OR 'news' OR 'newspaper
	article' OR 'patient education handout' OR 'periodical index' OR 'personal narratives' OR 'portraits' OR
	'practice guideline' OR 'review' OR 'video audio media')/it
12	#11 NOT ([animal cell]/lim OR [animal experiment]/lim OR [animal model]/lim OR [animal tissue]/lim OR
	mouse:ti OR murine:ti OR mice:ti)
13	#12 AND [english]/lim
14	#13 NOT [medline]/lim
Search	ran on January 07, 2021

Figure D1. PRISMA flow Chart Showing Results of Literature Search for Beti-Cel



Study Selection

We performed screening at both the abstract and full-text level. Three investigators screened all abstracts identified through electronic searches according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria described earlier. We did not exclude any study at abstract-level screening due to insufficient information. For example, an abstract that did not report an outcome of interest would be accepted for further review in full text. We retrieved the citations that were accepted during abstract-level screening for full text appraisal. Three investigators reviewed full papers and provided justification for exclusion of each excluded study.

Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

Data were extracted into Excel tables (Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, Washington). The basic design and elements of the extraction forms followed those used for other ICER reports. Elements included a description of the patient population, sample size, duration of follow-up, study design features, interventions (agent, dosage, frequency, schedules), and outcome assessments for each study. The data extraction was performed in the following steps:

- 1. One reviewer extracted information from the full articles, and a second reviewer validated the extracted data.
- 2. Extracted data were reviewed for logic, and a random proportion of data were validated by a third investigator for additional quality assurance.

Because studies were non-randomized and lacked a placebo or active control group, we did not assign any quality ratings to these trials. The limitations, uncertainties, and gaps in evidence of these trials are discussed in the Uncertainty and Controversies section.

Assessment of Level of Certainty in Evidence

We used the <u>ICER Evidence Rating Matrix</u> to evaluate the level of certainty in the available evidence of a net health benefit among each of the interventions of focus.^{57,58}

Assessment of Bias

We evaluated the evidence base for the presence of potential publication bias. Given the emerging nature of the evidence base for newer treatments, we will scan the <u>ClinicalTrials.gov</u> site to identify studies completed more than two years ago. Search terms include "betibeglogene autotemcel," "LentiGlobin" and "transfusion dependent beta thalassemia". We selected studies which would have met our inclusion criteria, and for which no findings have been published. We provided qualitative analysis of the objectives and methods of these studies to ascertain whether there may be a biased representation of study results in the published literature.

Data Synthesis and Statistical Analyses

Relevant data on key outcomes of the main studies were summarized qualitatively in the body of the review. Key differences between the studies in terms of the study design, patient characteristics, outcomes (including definitions and methods of assessments), and study quality were explored in the text of the report. The feasibility of conducting a quantitative synthesis was evaluated by looking at trial design, populations, analytic methods, and outcome assessments across outcomes of interest in the beti-cel trials. We were unable to conduct quantitative syntheses due to limitations in the available data (i.e., single-arm trials with small sample sizes). Nevertheless, pooled trial results from Phase I/II and Phase III trials of beti-cel have been published and we highlighted these data in our report.

D2. Evidence Tables

Table D4. Study Design

Trial	Study Design	Population	Inclusion & Exclusion Criteria	Key Outcomes [Timepoint]
NorthStar HGB-204 ¹⁸	Phase I/II, open	B-thalassemia	Inclusions	- Transfusion independence (TI) [up
	label, multi-site,	major	- Age 12-35 years	to 24 months post-infusion]
NCT01745120	single-arm, non-		- Diagnosis of TDT	- Duration of TI [up to 24 months]
	randomized		- History of ≥100 mL/kg/year of pRBCs or ≥8	- Time to achieving TI [up to 24
	trial		transfusions of pRBCs per year for the prior 2 years	months]
			- Eligible for allogeneic bone marrow transplant	- Weighted average hemoglobin
	N = 19		Exclusions	during TI [24 months]
			- Prior allogeneic transplant	
			- Evidence of severe iron overload	
HGB-205 ¹⁹	Phase I/II, open	Transfusion-	Inclusions	- Successful neutrophil and platelet
	label, single-arm	dependent beta	- Age 5-35 years	engraftment [24 months post-
NCT02151526	trial	thalassemia (TDT)	- Severe SCD or TDT (≥100 mL/kg/year of pRBCs)	infusion]
		or severe sickle-	- Eligible for HSCT, without matched related donor	- Transplant-related mortality [one-
	N = 7	cell disease (SCD)	- Additional requirements for subjects with SCD	year post-transplant]
			Exclusions	- Overall survival [24 months]
			- Clinically significant infection	- Transfusion independence [24
			- Prior/current malignancy, myeloproliferative, or	months
			immunodeficiency disorder	- Weighted average hemoglobin
			- White blood cell count <3×10 [°] /L and/or platelet	during II [24 months]
			count <120×10 ⁻ /L	- Duration of II [24 months]
Nouth Chau 2 (D)	Dhaaa III amam	TDT with sut a 00	- History of major organ damage	
	Phase III, open	TDT, without a po	Inclusions	- Transfusion independence (T)
HGD-207-*	abel, multi-site,		- Age Sou years (age <5 must weigh >6 kg and	Duration of TI [24 months]
NCTO2006202	Single-arm that	homoglobin & gono	Diagnosis of TDT	- Duration of Tr [24 months]
NC102900202	N - 22	(non BO/BO	History of >100 ml /kg/yoar of pPPCs, or >9	- Clifical adverse events [24
	IN - 25	(non-po/po	transfusions/waar if an >12 for the prior 2 waars	montrisj
		genotype)	- Eligible for HSCT	
			Fyclusions	
			$-\beta 0/\beta 0$ genotype	
			- Prior HSCT	
			- Any known/available HLA-matched family donor	

©Institute for Clinical and Economic Review, 2022 Draft Evidence Report – Beta Thalassemia

Trial	Study Design	Population	Inclusion & Exclusion Criteria	Key Outcomes [Timepoint]
NorthStar 3	Phase III, open	TDT, who have a	Inclusions	- Transfusion independence (TI)
HGB-212 ²¹	label, multi-site,	β0/β0, β0/IVS-I-	- Age ≤50 years (age <5 must weight >6 kg and	[12-24 months post-transplant]
	single-arm trial	110, or IVS-I-	provide minimum cells for manufacturing process)	- Duration of TI [12-24 months]
NCT03207009		110/IVS-I-110	- Diagnosis of TDT	- Weighted hemoglobin during TI
	N = 18	genotype (β0/β0	- History of ≥100 mL/kg/year of pRBCs or ≥8	[12-24 months]
		genotype)	transfusions of pRBCs per year (subjects ≥12 years)	- Transfusion reduction [12-24
			for the prior 2 years	months]
			- Eligible for HSCT	
			Exclusions	
			- Presence of a mutation other then $\beta 0$ (e.g., β +,	
			βE , βC) on at least one HBB allele	
			- Prior HSCT	
			- Any known/available HLA-matched family donor	
			- Evidence of severe iron overload	
NorthStar LTF-	Phase IV, multi-	β-thalassemia or	Inclusions	- Immune-related adverse events
303 ^{26,59}	center, long-	severe sickle cell	- Age ≤50 years	[15 years post-infusion]
	term follow-up	disease patients	- Treated with gene therapy for hemoglobinopathy	- Hematologic or neurologic
NCT02633943	study (LTF)	treated with	in bluebird bio-sponsored clinical trial	disorders [15 years]
		bluebird bio gene	Exclusions	- Malignancies [15 years]
	N = 57 as of last	therapy	- None	- Transfusion independence [15
	follow-up*			years]
HGB-206 ⁶⁰	Phase I/II, open	Severe sickle-cell	Inclusions	- Adverse events† [24 months post-
	label, multi-site,	disease	- ≥12 and ≤50 years of age	infusion]
NCT02140554	single arm trial		- Diagnosis of sickle cell disease with at least 4	
			vaso-occlusive events 24 months prior to consent	
	N = 35 [‡]		Exclusions	
			- Prior allogeneic transplant	

HLA: human leukocyte antigens, HSCT: hematopoietic stem-cell transplantation, kg: kilogram, L: liter, mL: milliliter, N: total number, pRBCs: packed red blood cells, SCD: sickle cell disease, TDT: transfusion-dependent beta thalassemia, TI: transfusion independence

* At median follow-up of 41.5 months (maximum 87.5 months); projected enrollment N = 63

[†] Outcomes on interest for HGB-206 are adverse events only as the trial was conducted in patients with sickle cell disease

‡ 35 patients from "Group C" of HGB-206 who were treated using a manufacturing process enhanced from other groups in the trial

Trial		NorthStar HGB-204			HGB-205
Population		TDT (non-β0/β0)	TDT (β0/β0)	Overall	TDT
N		11	8	19	4
	Enrolled	NR	NR	23	4
Study Disposition n	Mobilized	NR	NR	19	4
Study Disposition, h	Conditioned	NR	NR	18	4
	Infused	NR	NR	18	4
A 20 . V0000	Mean (SD)	22.7 (6.50)*	24.1 (7.62)*	23.3 (6.82)*	NR
Age, years	Median (range)	NR	NR	20 (12-35)	17.5 (16-19)*
Sev. n (%)	Female	7 (63.6)	6 (75.0)	13 (68.4)	2 (50)
Sex, n (%)	Male	4 (36.4)	2 (25.0)	6 (31.6)	2 (50)
	Asian	8 (72.7)	6 (75.0)	14 (73.7)	2 (50)
	White	2 (18.2)	2 (25.0)	4 (21.1)	2 (50)
Race, n (%)	Black	0	0	0	0
	Indigenous	0	0	0	0
	Other	1 (9.1)	0	1 (5.3)	0
	β0/β0	0†	8†	8/18 (44)	0
	βΕ/βΟ		0+	6/18 (33)	3 (75)
Genotype, n (%)	β0/β+	11†		4/18 (22)	0
	β+/β+				1 (25)
Age at first transfusion, years	Median (range)	NR	NR	3.5 (0-26.0)	1.8 (0-14.0)
Transfusion volume, ml/kg/year	Median (range)	NR	NR	164 (124-261)	182 (139-197)
Previous splene	ctomy, n (%)	NR	NR	6/18 (33)	3 (75)
Cardiac T2*, msec	Median (range)	NR	NR	NR (27-39)	NR

Table D5. Baseline Characteristics: Phase I/II Trials^{17,18,61}

Baseline characteristics not reported: Number of transfusions per year, liver iron concentration, serum ferritin level, fertility preservation

kg: kilogram, ml: milliliter, msec: millisecond, n: number, N: total number, NR: not reported, SD: standard deviation, TDT: transfusion-dependent beta thalassemia

* Age at consent

+ Assumed from trial design

Trial		NorthStar 2 HGB-207	NorthStar 3 HGB-212	NorthStar 2 & 3 Pooled
Population		TDT (non-β0/β0)	ΤDT (β0/β0)	Pooled
N		23	15†	41
	Consented	32	19	NR
Study Dispesition a	Mobilized	24	17	43
Study Disposition, n	Conditioned	NR	NR	41
	Infused	23	15	41
	Mean (SD)	NR	NR	15.1 (7.9)
Age, years	Median (range)	15 (4-34)	15 (4-33)*	13 (4-34)
Sev. 7 (%)	Female	12 (52)	7 (47)	20 (48.8)
Sex, h (%)	Male	11 (48)	8 (53)	21 (51.2)
	Asian	13 (57)		NR
	White	8 (35)		
Race, n (%)	Black	0	NR	
	Indigenous	0		
	Other	2 (9)		
	β0/β0	0	9 (60)	12 (29)
G_{2}	βΕ/βΟ	6 (26)	0	6 (15)
Genotype, II (%)	β0/β+	12 (52)	3 (20)	15 (37)
	β+/β+	5 (22)	3 (20)	8 (20)
Age at first transfusion, years	Median (range)	1 (<1-7)	0.7 (0.3-11.0)	NR
Transfusion volume, ml/kg/year	Median (range)	207.9 (142.1-274.4)	181 (75-276)	199.6 (43.6)
Transfusions per year	Median (range)	16.0 (11.5-37.0)	17.5 (11.0-39.5)	Mean (SD): 17.9 (6.32)
Liver iron concentration, mg/g	Median (range)	5.3 (1.0-41.0)	5.8 (1.2-13.2)	Mean (SD): 6.9 (7.2)
Cardiac T2*, msec	Median (range)	36.7 (21.0-57.0)	39 (15-75)	NR
Serum ferritin level, ng/ml	Median (range)	1975.2 (349-10,021)	NR	Mean (SD): 4448 (3689)
Previous splenectomy, n (%)		4 (17)	3 (20)	7 (17.1)
Fertility preservation, n (%)		NR	NR	30 (73.2)

Table D6. Baseline Characteristics: Phase III Trials^{5,24,25,40,62}

g: gram, kg: kilogram, mg: milligram, ml: milliliter, msec: millisecond, n: number, N: total number, ng: nanogram, NR: not reported, SD: standard deviation, TDT: transfusion-dependent beta thalassemia

* Age at consent

⁺ Data as of March 2020 from only 15 infused patients, 18 patients have been infused to date, but data has not been publicly presented.
Trial		NorthStar LTF-303		
Phase		Phase I/II	Phase III	
Ν		22	35	
Age, years Median (range)		20 (12-35)	15 (5-34)	
Sov. p (%)	Female	28	(55)*	
Sex, II (%)	Male	23	(45)*	
Transfusion volume, ml/kg/year	Median (range)	171.2 (124.4-273.2)	192.9 (74.6-276.1)	
Transfusions per year	Median (range)	13 (10-17.5)	17.5 (11-39.5)	
Liver iron concentration, mg/g	Median (range)	7.1 (0.4-26.4)	4.9 (1.0-41.0)	
Cardiac T2*, msec	Median (range)	34 (10-54)	36.8 (15-75)	
Serum ferritin level, ng/ml	Median (range)	3146.8 (748-8629)	3671.9 (784-22517)	
Previous splenectom	Previous splenectomy, n (%)		7 (20)	
Fertility preservation, n (%)		13 (59.1)	25 (71.4)	

Table D7. Baseline Characteristics: Long-Term Follow-Up²³

Baseline characteristics not reported: Race, genotype, age at first transfusion

g: gram, kg: kilogram, LTF: long-term follow-up, mg: milligram, ml: milliliter, msec: millisecond, n: number, N: total number, ng: nanogram, SD: standard deviation

* Data as of March 2021 with 51 enrolled patients

Table D8. Efficacy: Phase I/II Trials^{17,18,27,28,61}

	Trial		NorthStar HGB-204		
Ро	pulation	TDT (non-β0/β0)	TDT (β0/β0)	Overall	TDT
	Ν	10	8	18	4
Follow-up, Me	dian months (Range)		40.7 (29.3-53.8)		49.6 (40.5-60.6)
Successful Neutrophil	Incidence, n (%)	10 (100)	8 (100)	18 (100)	4 (100)
Engraftment	Time to Event, median days (range)	18.5 (14-27)	19.5 (15-30)	18.5 (14-30)	16.5 (14-29)
Successful Platelet	Incidence, n (%)	10 (100)	8 (100)	18 (100)	4 (100)
Engraftment	Time to Event, median days (range)	50.5 (19-191)	36 (31-55)	39.5 (19-191)	23 (20-26)
Duration of Hospitalization* Median days (range)		NR	NR	40 (27-69)	NR
	Incidence, n (%)	8 (80.0)	3 (37.5)	11 (61.1)	3/4 (75)
Transfusion Independence	Duration, median months (range)	38.0 (21.2-45.3)	16.4 (16.1-20.8)	NR	21.7 (21.2-21.8)‡
	Time to Event, median days (range)	17.12 (15.0-20.9)	17.5 (17.5-17.5)	17.51 (15.0-20.9)	14.9 (14.9-15.6)‡
Transfusion Volume Reduction in patients without TI	Median % (range)	Patient 1: 73 Patient 2: 43	53 (10-72)	NR	NR
Hemoglobin level during TI,	Mean (SD)	10.44 (1.28)	10.11 (NC)	10.41 (1.20)	NR
g/dl	Median (range)	10.3 (9.1-13.2)	9.9 (9.5-10.1)	NR	11.3 (10.6-13.1)‡
Liver iron concentration, mg/g	Median (range)	NR	NR	% Reduction: 56 (38-83)†	NR
Cardiac T2*, msec	Median (range)	NR	NR	NR (31.4 - 57.6)	NR
Serum ferritin level, ng/ml	Median (range)	NR	NR	% Reduction: 55 (16-78)†	NR
Iron chelation post-infusion in patients with TI	Restarted and stopped, n (%)	NR	NR	NR	4 (100)

Efficacy outcomes not reported: N restarting and continuing or never restarting iron chelation post-infusion

dl: deciliter, g: gram, kg: kilogram, mg: milligram, ml: milliliter, msec: millisecond, n: number, N: total number, NC: not calculated, ng: nanogram, Pt: patient, SD: standard deviation, TI: transfusion independent/independence

 $\ensuremath{^*}$ Hospitalization from conditioning to discharge

+ From screening to month 48 (N=4)

‡ Data as of March 2020, all other HGB-205 data as of June 2019

Table D9. Efficacy: Phase III Trials^{5,24,25,62}

-	Trial	NorthStar 2 HGB-207	NorthStar 3 HGB-212	NorthStar 2 & 3 Pooled	
Рор	ulation	TDT (non-β0/β0)	TDT (β0/β0)	Pooled	
	Ν	23	15‡	41	
Follow-up, Med	ian months (Range)	29.5 (13.0-48.2)	14.4 (1.1-24.0)	24.3 (0.9-42.2)	
Successful Neutrophil	Incidence, n (%)	23 (100)	15 (100)	40/40† (100)	
Engraftment	Time to Event, median days (range)	23 (13-32)	26 (14-38)	25.5 (13-39)	
Successful Distalat Engraftmant	Incidence, n (%)	23 (100)	13/15 (87)	40/40† (100)	
Successiul Platelet Engrantment	Time to Event, median days (range)	46 (20-94)	41 (21-64)	46 (13-94)	
Duration of Hospitalization* Median days (range)		45 (30-92)	NR	44 (29-92)	
Transfusion Independence	Incidence, n (%)	20/22 (91)	6/8 (75)	32/36 (89)	
	Duration, median months (range)	20.4 (15.7-21.6)	13.6 (12.2-21.2)	20.6 (12.3–39.4)	
Transfusion Volume Reduction	Madian %	Patient 2: 67.4	Patient 4: 80	ND	
in patients without TI		Patient 20: 22.7	Patient 8: 31	INK	
Hemoglobin level during TI, g/dl	Median (range)	11.7 (9.5-12.8)	11.5 (9.5-13.5)	11.52 (9.3-13.7)	
Liver iron concentration, mg/g	Median (range)	4.9 (1.4-20.3)	NR	NR	
Cardiac T2*, msec	Median (range)	35.1 (15–47)	NR	NR	
Serum ferritin level, ng/ml	Median (range)	862 (94-8443)	NR	NR	
Iron cholation pact infusion in	Restarted and stopped, n (%)	4/20 (20)	NR	NR	
non cheration post-infusion in	Restarted and continued, n (%)	7/20 (35)	NR	NR	
	Never restarted, n (%)	9/20 (45)	NR	NR	
Efficacy outcomes not reported: Tir	me to TL mean hemoglobin level during	ГІ			

dl: deciliter, g: gram, kg: kilogram, mg: milligram, ml: milliliter, msec: millisecond, n: number, N: total number, ng: nanogram, SD: standard deviation, TI: transfusion independent/independence

* Hospitalization from conditioning to discharge

+ Patients with >1.3 months of follow-up

‡ Data as of March 2020 from only 15 infused patients, 18 patients have been infused to date, but data has not been publicly presented.

Table D10. Efficacy: Long-Term Follow-Up²⁶

	Trial	NorthStar LTF-303			
Р	opulation	Phase I/II	Phase III		
	Ν	22	29		
Follow-up, M	edian months (Range)	44.2 (22.9-86.5)			
Successful Neutrophil	Incidence, n (%)	51 (2	100)		
Engraftment	Time to Event, median days (range)	22 (1	3-38)		
Successful Distalat Engraftmant	Incidence, n (%)	NR	NR		
Successiul Platelet Engrantment	Time to Event, median days (range)	41 (19-191)			
Transfusion Independence	Incidence, n (%)	15 (68.2)	31/35* (89)		
	Duration, median months (range)	32.2 (13.1-84.1)			
Hemoglobin level during TI,	Madian (rango)	Month 24: 10.0 (9.7-11.8);	11 6 (0 51 12 7)*		
g/dl	Median (range)	Month 72: 10.5 (10.3-12.1)	11.0 (9.51-13.7)		
Liver iron concentration, mg/g	Median (range)	n=15; 4.5 (0.9-11.2)	n=24; 4.5 (1.4-20.3)		
Cardiac T2*, msec	Median (range)	n=15; 40 (30-65)	n=23; 34 (23-47)		
Serum ferritin level, ng/ml	Median (range)	n=15; 1267 (209-8613)	n=25; 1389 (351-15378)		
Iron chalation next infusion in	Restarted and stopped, n (%)	10 (67)	7/25 (28)		
iron chelation post-infusion in	Restarted and continued, n (%)	5 (33)	NR		
	Never restarted, n (%)	0	11/25 (44)		
Efficacy outcomes not reported: Duration of hospitalization from conditioning to discharge, time to TL transfusion infusion reduction in patients without TL					

Efficacy outcomes not reported: Duration of hospitalization from conditioning to discharge, time to TI, transfusion infusion reduction in patients without TI

dl: deciliter, g: gram, kg: kilogram, LTF: long-term follow-up, mg: milligram, ml: milliliter, msec: millisecond, n: number, N: total number, ng: nanogram, TI: transfusion independent/independence

* From a presentation with data as of August 2021, all other LTF-303 data from the presentation abstract as of March 2021.

Table D11. Safety: Phase I/II Trials^{18,61,63}

Trial	Trial		NorthStar HGB-204			HGB-206
Population		TDT (non-β0/β0)	TDT (β0/β0)	TDT	TDT	SCD*
N		11	8	19	4	35
	Overall	10 (90.9)	8 (100)	18 (94.7)	4 (100)	35 (100)
Adverse Events, n (%)	Serious	6 (54.5)	4 (50.0)	10 (52.6)	2 (50)	12 (34)
	Grade 3/4	NR	NR	NR	NR	34 (97)
Treatment-related Adverse	Overall	NR	NR	NR	NR	3 (9)†
Events, n (%)	Serious	NR	NR	NR	0	NR
	Overall	0	0	0	0	1
wortanty, fl (%)	AE-related	0	0	0	0	0

©Institute for Clinical and Economic Review, 2022 Draft Evidence Report – Beta Thalassemia

Trial		NorthStar HGB-204			HGB-205	HGB-206
	Transplant- related	0	0	0	0	0
		Adverse Ever	ts of Special Interest,	n (%)		
Stomatitic	Overall	8 (72.7)	5 (62.5)	13 (68.4)	NR	NR
Stomatitis	Grade ≥3	NR	NR	NR (≥25)	4 (100)	24 (69)
Anomio	Overall	9 (81.8)	8 (100)	17 (89.5)	NR	NR
Allennia	Grade ≥3	NR	NR	NR	NR	13 (37)
Noutrononia	Overall	6 (54.6)	4 (50)	10 (52.6)	NR	NR
Neutropenia	Grade ≥3	NR	NR	NR	NR	19 (54)
Echrile Neutropopia	Overall	7 (63.6)	4 (50.0)	11 (57.9)	NR	NR
Febrile Neutropenia	Grade ≥3	NR	NR	NR (≥25)	NR	15 (43)
Thromhocutononia	Overall	10 (90.9)	8 (100)	18 (94.7)	NR	NR
Infontbocytopenia	Grade ≥3	NR	NR	NR	NR	23 (66)
Laukanania	Overall	5 (45.5)	1 (12.5)	6 (31.6)	NR	NR
Leukopenia	Grade ≥3	NR	NR	NR	NR	11 (31)
Lymphopenia	Grade ≥3	NR	NR	NR	NR	2 (6)
Vana acclusiva livar disaasa	Serious	1 (9.1)	1 (12.5)	2 (10.5)	NR	0
veno occlusive liver disease	Grade ≥3	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
Splenomegaly	Overall	0	1 (12.5)	1 (5.3)	NR	NR
Bone Pain	Overall	2 (18.2)	1 (12.5)	3 (15.8)	NR	NR
Infection	Overall	0 (0)	4 (50.00)	4 (21.05)	NR	NR
Pharyngeal inflammation	Grade ≥3	NR	NR	NR (≥25)	NR	2 (6)
Decreased Appetite	Grade ≥3	NR	NR	NR	NR	3 (9)
Nausea	Grade ≥3	NR	NR	NR	NR	4 (11)
Increase in alanine aminotransferase	Grade ≥3	NR	NR	NR	2 (50)	3 (9)
Increased blood bilirubin level	Grade ≥3	NR	NR	NR	NR	2 (6)
Acute myeloid leuke	mia	NR	NR	No reported "oncogenesis"	NR	NR

Safety outcomes not reported: Pyrexia, congestive cardiac failure, epistaxis, hypoxia, neutropenic sepsis, mucosal inflammation, myelodysplastic syndrome, infertility

AEs: adverse events, n: number, N: total number, NR: not reported, SCD: sickle cell disease, TDT: transfusion-dependent beta thalassemia

* 35 patients from "Group C" of HGB-206 who were treated using a manufacturing process enhanced from other groups in the trial

[†] All events resolved one week following their onset

Table D12. Safety: Phase III Trials^{24,25,62}

Trial		NorthStar 2 HGB-207	NorthStar 3 HGB-212	NorthStar 2 & 3 Pooled
Population		TDT (non-β0/β0)	ΤDT (β0/β0)	TDT
N		23	15	41
Advance Events in (%)	Overall	23 (100)	NR	NR
Adverse Events, h (%)	Serious	NR	3 (20)	NR
Treatment-related* Adverse	Overall	Thrombocytopenia: 2 (9)	Number of events: 5	Abdominal pain: 3 (7) Thrombocytopenia: 3 (7)
Events, II (76)	Serious	1 (4)	0	Thrombocytopenia: 1 (2)
Mortality, n (%)	Overall	0	0	0
	Α	dverse Events of Special Interest	:, n (%)	
Stomatitis	Serious	NR	1 (7)	2 (5)
Stomatitis	Grade ≥3	14 (61)	5 (33)	17/34 (50)
Anomia	Serious	NR	NR	NR
Allellila	Grade ≥3	14 (61)	NR	NR
Nautrononia	Serious	NR	1 (7)	2 (5)
Neutropenia	Grade ≥3	18 (78)	NR	NR
Fabrila Nautronania	Serious	NR	1 (7)	2 (5)
	Grade ≥3	8 (35)	9 (60)	14/34 (41)
Thrombocytonenia	Serious	2 (9)	1 (7)	3 (7)
mombocytopenia	Grade ≥3	22 (96)	NR	NR
Leukopenia	Grade ≥3	13 (57)	NR	NR
Lymphopenia	Grade ≥3	2 (9)	NR	NR
Neutropenic sepsis	Grade ≥3	2 (9)	NR	NR
Vana acclusiva livar disaasa	Serious	NR	0 (0)	3 (7)
veno occiusive liver disease	Grade ≥3	Grade 4: 3 (13)	NR	3/34 (9)
Mucosal inflammation	Grade ≥3	NR	3 (20)	NR
Congestive cardiac failure	Serious	NR	1 (7)	NR
Byrovia	Serious	2 (9)	2 (13)	4 (10)
Γγιελία	Grade ≥3	4 (17)	NR	3/34 (9)
Pharyngeal inflammation	Grade ≥3	2 (9)	2 (13)	NR
Epistaxis	Grade ≥3	5 (22)	NR	NR
Нурохіа	Grade ≥3	2 (9)	NR	NR
Decreased Appetite	Grade ≥3	3 (13)	3 (20)	NR

Trial		NorthStar 2 HGB-207	NorthStar 3 HGB-212	NorthStar 2 & 3 Pooled		
Increase in alanine aminotransferase	Grade ≥3	2 (9)	3 (20)	NR		
Increased blood bilirubin level	Grade ≥3	2 (9)	NR	NR		
Acute myeloid leukemia		0 No reported "oncogenesis"		NR		
Cofety autoeness wet was anted. Cue	d = 2/4 AFs. two stress such us					

Safety outcomes not reported: Grade 3/4 AEs, treatment-related AEs, splenomegaly, bone pain, infection, myelodysplastic syndrome, infertility

n: number , N: total number, NR: not reported, TDT: transfusion-dependent beta thalassemia

* Related or possibly related to beti-cel as determined by investigators

Table D13. Safety: Long-Term Follow-Up^{26,64}

Trial		NorthStar LTF LTF-303	
Population		TDT	
Follow-Up Time		After 2 years in LTF-303: 41.5 months (range: 23-87.5)	
Ν		57	
Advarsa Evants $n(%)$	Overall	0	
Adverse Events, II (%)	Serious	8 (15.7)	
Treatment-related Adverse Events, n (%)	Grade 1/2	12/51 (24)*	
	Grade 3/4	Thrombocytopenia: 1/51 (2.0)*	
	Overall	0	
Mortality, n (%)	AE-related	0	
	Transplant-related	0	
	Adverse Events of Speci	al Interest, n (%)	
Neutropenia	Serious	1 (2.0)	
Acute myeloid leukemia		No reported malignancies	
Safety outcomes not reported: Grade 3/4 adverse events, stomatitis, anemia, neutropenia, febrile neutropenia, lymphopenia, neutropenic sepsis, veno occlusive liver disease, splenomegaly, bone pain, infection, mucosal inflammation, congestive cardiac failure, pyrexia, pharyngeal inflammation.			

epistaxis, hypoxia, decreased appetite, nausea, increase in alanine aminotransferase, increased blood bilirubin level, myelodysplastic syndrome, infertility

n: number , N: total number, NR: not reported, TDT: transfusion-dependent beta thalassemia

* Occurring at median 15.7 months (range: 0.5-60.6) of follow-up, N = 51; not occurring two years after LTF-303.

HRQOL Instrument	Population	Timepoint	N assessed	Mean Score (SE)
		Baseline	12	81.4 (SD: 19.2)
EQ-5D-1 VAS	11-17 years	Month 12	NR	91.6 (SD: 4.9)
Score range: 0-100		Month 24	NR	92.4 (SD: 6.0)
EQ-5D-3L VAS Score range: 0-100		Baseline	12	85.2 (SD: 10.5)
	> 18 years	Month 12	NR	90.9 (SD: 4.5)
Score range: 0-100		Month 24	NR	94.2 (SD: 4.8)
FO FD 31 Juday		Baseline	12	0.92 (SD: 0.15)
EQ-5D-3L Index Score range: 0-1	> 18 years	Month 12	NR	0.96 (SD: 0.07)
		Month 24	NR	0.95 (SD: 0.08)
PedsQL* Score range: 0-100, MCID = 4.36	< 18 years	Baseline	18	77.4 (3.6)
		Month 12	17	85.3 (2.0)
		Month 24	15	87.1 (1.8)
	> 18 years	Baseline	12	53.8 (1.4)
SF-30 PCS		Month 12	12	55.4 (1.2)
Score range: $0-100$, MCID = 2		Month 24	11	55.7 (1.4)
ST 2C MOST		Baseline	12	51.0 (1.7)
SF-36 MICS Score range: 0.100 MCID = 2	> 18 years	Month 12	12	52.7 (2.0)
Score range. 0-100, MCID – 2		Month 24	11	53.4 (2.3)
FACT DNAT		Baseline	11	125.8 (3.4)
FACT-BIVIT	> 18 years	Month 12	NR	128.4 (3.3)
Score range: 0-196		Month 24	NR	128.9 (3.0)
		Baseline	11	94.2 (2.6)
FACT-G	> 18 years	Month 12	NR	96.1 (2.5)
Score range: 0-108		Month 24	NR	95.8 (2.1)

Table D14. Quality of Life: Pooled Phase III Trials (NorthStar 2 & 3)⁵

Quality of life data not reported for: HGB-204, HGB-205, LTF-303

EQ-5D-3L VAS: EuroQol visual analog scale, EQ-5D-Y VAS: EuroQol visual analog scale-youth, FACT-BMT: Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-Bone Marrow, FACT-G: Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-General, MCID: minimal clinically important difference, NR: not reported, PedsQL: Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory, SD: standard deviation, SE: standard error, SF-36 MCS: Short Form-36 Health Survey Mental Component Summary, SF-36 PCS: Short Form-36 Health Survey Physical Component Summary

* Global population norm = 81

+ General population norm = 50

Tri	al		NorthStar 2 & 3 Pooled	
Age Subgro	oups, years	<12	≥12, <18	>18
N	l	16	11	NR
Follow-up, media	n months (range)		23.1 (0.9-35.5)*	
	Baseline	Characteristics		
Age, years	Median (range)	8 (4-11)	15 (12-17)	NR
Efficacy Outcomes				
Time to Neutrophil Engraftment Median days (range)		26 (17-39)	26 (16-38)	NR
Time to Platelet Engraftment	Median days (range)	50 (13-94)	50.0 (25-84)	NR
Transfusion Indonondansa	Incidence, n (%)	9/11 (81.2)	10/10 (100)	11/13 (84.6)
	Duration, median months (range)	19.5 (12.3-32.0)		NR
Hemoglobin level during TI, g/dl	Median (range)	10.0 (9.5-11.4)	11.5 (9.6-13.0)	12.6 (9.9-13.6)
	Safet	y Outcomes		
Treatment-Related A	dverse Events, n (%)	2 (12.5)	2 (18.2)	
Vana acclusiva livar disaasa n (%)	Grade 2	1 (6.3)	0	
	Grade 4	0	2 (18.2)	
	Stomatitis	14 (51.9)	
	Febrile Neutropenia	13 (4	48.1)	
	Epistaxis	6 (2	2.2)	NR
Grade ≥3 Adverse Events†, n (%)	Decreased appetite	5 (1	.8.5)	
	Нурохіа	3 (1	.1.1)	
	Pyrexia	3 (1	.1.1)]
	Increased alanine aminotransferase	3 (11.1)		

Table D15. Additional Subgroups: Pooled Phase III Trials³²

dl: deciliter, g: gram, n: number, N: total number, NR: not reported, TI: transfusion independence

* Data as of November 2020

+ in ≥3 patients

D3. Ongoing Studies

Table D16. Ongoing Studies*

Title / Trial Sponsor	Study Design & Intervention	Patient Population	Key Outcomes	Estimated Completion
A Study Evaluating the	Single-arm, multi-site,	Inclusions	Primary	February
Efficacy and Safety of the	single-dose, Phase III	- Age ≤50 years (age <5 years must weigh >6 kg and	- Transfusion	2022
LentiGlobin [®] BB305 Drug	study	provide minimum cells for manufacturing process)	independence [12-24	
Product in Subjects with		- Diagnosis of TDT	months post-transplant]	
Transfusion-Dependent	Actual enrollment: N = 23	- History of ≥100 mL/kg/year of pRBCs, or guideline-		
β-Thalassemia, who do		driven management of ≥8 transfusions/year if age	Secondary	
Not Have a β0/β0	Intervention: IV infusion	≥12, for the prior 2 years	- Engraftment	
Genotype (NorthStar-2)	of beti-cel following	- Eligible for HSCT	- Insertional oncogenesis	
	myeloablative	Exclusions	- Adverse events	
bluebird bio	conditioning with	- β0/β0 genotype		
	busulfan	- Prior HSCT		
<u>NCT02906202</u>		- Any known/available HLA-matched family donor		
A Study Evaluating the	Single-arm, multi-site,	Inclusions	Primary	November
Efficacy and Safety of the	single-dose, Phase III	- Age ≤50 years (age <5 years must weight >6 kg and	- Transfusion	2022
LentiGlobin [®] BB305 Drug	study	provide minimum cells for manufacturing process)	independence [12-24	
Product in Participants		- Diagnosis of TDT	months post-transplant]	
with Transfusion-	Actual enrollment: N = 18	- History of ≥100 mL/kg/year of pRBCs or ≥8		
Dependent β-		transfusions of pRBCs per year (subjects ≥12 years)	Secondary	
Thalassemia (NorhtStar-	Intervention: IV infusion	for the prior 2 years	- Duration of transfusion	
3)	of beti-cel following	- Eligible for HSCT	independence	
	myeloablative	Exclusions	 Average weighted 	
bluebird bio	conditioning with	- Presence of a mutation other then β 0 (e.g., β +, β E,	hemoglobin during	
	busulfan	βC) on at least one HBB allele.	transfusion independence	
<u>NCT03207009</u>		- Prior HSCT		
		 Any known/available HLA-matched family donor 		
		- Evidence of severe iron overload		

Source: <u>www.ClinicalTrials.gov</u>

HLA: human leukocyte antigen, HSCT: hematopoietic stem-cell transplantation, kg: kilogram, mL: milliliter, N: total number, pRBC: packed red blood cells, TDT: transfusion-dependent beta thalassemia

* Ongoing studies of beti-cel are also included in this review

D4. Previous Systematic Reviews and Technology Assessments

We identified one health technology assessment that was initiated by NICE. We identified completed assessments from France and Germany.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE, England)

Betibeglogene autotemcel for treating transfusion-dependent beta thalassaemia

NICE began an appraisal of the clinical and cost-effectiveness of betibeglogene autotemcel for the treatment of transfusion-dependent beta-thalassemia. The review was officially suspended in December 2021 due to a decision from the company sponsor to withdraw its marketing application from the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency.

Haute Autorité de Santé (HAS, France)

Zynteglo (betibeglogene autotemcel) for β-thalassemia

France's HAS judged the clinical benefit of betibeglogene autotemcel to be substantial and recommended its reimbursement in the treatment of patients ages 12 - 35 years with transfusion-dependent beta-thalassemia who do not have a $\beta 0/\beta 0$ genotype, for whom HSCT is appropriate, but an HLA-matched related donor is not available. In this population, the clinical added value was judged to be moderate (CAV III).

The assessment determined there was insufficient evidence of clinical benefit to support funding by the French national insurance system in patients over 35 years.

Federal Joint Committee (G-BA, Germany)

Benefit Assessment of betibeglogene autotemcel (β-thalassemia)

The German Federal Joint Committee's (G-BA's) benefit assessment focused on betibeglogene autotemcel for the treatment of patients ages >12 years with transfusion dependent beta thalassemia and a non- $\beta 0/\beta 0$ genotype. The G-BA concluded that the data did not permit quantification of clinical benefit due to the lack of comparative data. Although they acknowledged that the data on transfusion independence demonstrated a clear benefit with regard to preventing anemia, the extent to which transfusion independence resolves complications from routine transfusions remained uncertain. The G-BA was also uncertain about whether iron chelation therapy remained necessary in patients who achieved transfusion independence.

Systematic Literature Review

Badawy S.M., et al., (2021). "A systematic review of quality of life in sickle cell disease and thalassemia after stem cell transplant or gene therapy"⁶⁵

Investigators conducted a systematic review of recent evidence for the effectiveness of HSCT and gene therapy on health-related quality of life (HRQOL) in patients with sickle cell disease (SCD) and thalassemia. Sixteen studies were included in the review, ten of which included patients with thalassemia. The thalassemia studies evaluated HRQOL with a variety of HRQOL instruments, including the Pediatric Quality of Life, Short Form 36, European Quality of Life 5D, and Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-Bone Marrow Transplant survey.

Overall, studies reported significant improvement in HRQOL following HSCT in thalassemia patients. Worse HRQOL scores were generally associated with graft versus host disease. Studies identified for HRQOL outcomes following gene therapy in thalassemia have shown promising improvements in outcomes. Those who achieved transfusion independence following gene therapy in the thalassemia population had greater improvement in HRQOL.

E. Long-Term Cost-Effectiveness: Supplemental Information

E1. Detailed Methods

Table E1.1. Impact Inventory

		Included in Th	cluded in This Analysis Notes on Sources	
Sector	Type of Impact	from [] Perspective?		quantified), Likely
Sector	(Add additional domains, as relevant)	Health Care	Societal	Magnitude & Impact
		Sector	Societai	(if not)
Formal Health C	Care Sector			
	Longevity effects	Х	х	
Hoolth				Includes caregiver
Outcomos	Health-related quality of life effects	Х	Х	impacts for modified
Outcomes				societal perspective
	Adverse events	Х	Х	
	Paid by third-party payers	Х	Х	
Modical Costs	Paid by patients out-of-pocket	Х	Х	
Weulcal Costs	Future related medical costs	Х	Х	
	Future unrelated medical costs	Х	Х	
Informal Health	Care Sector			
Llaalth	Patient time costs	NA	Х	
Health-	Unpaid caregiver-time costs	NA	Х	
Related Costs	Transportation costs	NA		
Non-Health Car	e Sector			
	Labor market earnings lost	NA	Х	
	Cost of unpaid lost productivity due to		v	
Productivity	illness	NA	X	
	Cost of uncompensated household		v	
	production	NA		
Consumption	Future consumption unrelated to health	NA		
Social convicos	Cost of social services as part of	ΝΑ		
Social services	intervention	NA		
Legal/Criminal	Number of crimes related to intervention	NA		
Justice	Cost of crimes related to intervention	NA		
Education	Impact of intervention on educational	NA		
Education	achievement of population	NA		
Housing	Cost of home improvements,	NA		
nousing	remediation	NA		
Environment	Production of toxic waste pollution by	NA		
LINNOITHEIL	intervention			
Other	Other impacts (if relevant)	NA		

NA: not applicable

Adapted from Sanders et al.⁶⁶

Treatment Strategies

The intervention of interest was betibeglogene autotemcel (beti-cel), and the comparator of interest for this intervention was standard of care (RBC transfusions and iron chelation).

Target Population

The population of focus for the economic evaluation included patients with TDT. The patient characteristics that informed the model's base-case cohort were primarily informed by the Thalassemia Longitudinal Cohort (TLC) study (Table E1.2). We supplemented data from the TLC with other sources, where data gaps existed – e.g., age distribution, mean number of transfusions per year, and mean weight of the cohort. To explore the impact of alternate baseline population characteristics, we conducted a scenario analysis using data from Phase III beti-cel trials.

	Betibeglogene Autotemcel		
	Base Case		
Mean Age, years	22.2 (12.5)	15.1 (7.95)	
Age distribution, %	-	-	
2 to 11 years	31.6*	NA	
12 to 17 years	13.4*	NA	
18 to 23 years	11.1*	NA	
24 to 29 years	11.1*	NA	
30 to 34 years	8.2*	NA	
35 to 39 years	8.2*	NA	
40 to 44 years	8.2*	NA	
45 to 50 years	8.2*	NA	
Age < 18 years, %	45.0*	65.9 ³²	
Weight, kg	-	NA	
< 18 years	34.4*	NA	
≥ 18 years	72.4*	NA	
Female, %	52.3	48.8	
Mean number of transfusions per year	-	17.9 (6.3)	
< 18 years	14.95*	NA	
≥ 18 years	16.1*	NA	
Type of iron chelation therapy, %	-	-	
Deferasirox (oral)	54.0*	NA	
Deferiprone (oral)	16.0*	NA	
Deferasirox + Deferiprone (oral)	4.0*	NA	
Deferoxamine mesylate (SC)	7.0*	NA	
Oral + Deferoxamine mesylate (SC)	19.0*	NA	
Serum ferritin, low / moderate / high, %**	41.0 / 40.0 / 19.0	NA	
LIC, low / moderate / high, % [§]	45.0 / 32.0 / 23.0	NA	
Myocardial T2*, low / moderate / high, % [#]	71.0 / 29.0 / 0.0	NA	
Primary Data Source	Thalassemia Longitudinal Cohort	Phase III Trial Data	
	(Kwiatkowski et al., 2012, 2006)	(Northstar-2 and -3)	
	Kwiatkowski et al., 2012°'; NERI,	Bluebird bio data on	
Additional data sources	2018 ⁴¹ ; Kansal 2021 ³³ ; *Market	file ⁴⁰ ; Kulozik et al.,	
	Scan data reported in Kansal 2021 ⁶⁸	2021 ³²	

LIC: liver iron concentration, NA: not available, SC: subcutaneous

* Value not available in primary data source

+ Median (range)

‡ Median (IQR)

§ low iron, <7 mg/g; moderate iron, 7–15 mg/g; high iron, ≥15 mg/g

Myocardial T2*: low iron, >20 ms; moderate iron, 10–20 ms; high iron, <10 ms

x patients up to 19 years of age

** low iron, ≤1,000 ng/mL; moderate iron, 1,000–2,500 ng/mL; high iron, >2,500 ng/mL

©Institute for Clinical and Economic Review, 2022 Draft Evidence Report – Beta Thalassemia

E2. Model Inputs and Assumptions

Model Inputs

Our model includes several assumptions stated in Table E2.1.

Table E2.1. Key Model Inputs

Assumption	Rationale
Real world cohort study sources were used to	Larger sample sizes were available from cohort
characterize the model cohort.	studies and experts suggested wider possible age
	bands will consider beti-cel therapy, if available.
The baseline distribution of iron overload risk	Manufacturer submitted data and longitudinal
categories was consistent between beti-cel and	cohort studies suggest no strong evidence of
SOC arms. Patients entering the model in the	increases in the proportion of iron overload
transfusion dependent health state retained this	severity over time. A five-year iron normalization
distribution of iron overload for the duration of	period was deemed reasonable based on data
the model. Patients entering the model in the	suggesting that the median time to achieve
transfusion independent health state progressed	target ferritin levels (<300ng/mL or <500ng/mL)
through an iron normalization period of five years	for individuals with baseline ferritin levels of
where a digutility aligned with the TD state was	2250011g/11L was 64 months and 65 months,
applied At the end of the iron normalization	neriod evidence suggests serum ferritin may
period natients aged 2 to 11 years of age were	remain above the reference range. This risk is
considered at no risk of complications and	likely to vary by age and thus we assigned "low
patients >12 years were considered at "low risk"	risk" of complications rather than zero risk for
of complications.	patients aged ≥ 12 years. ^{25,37}
Complications modeled included cardiac, liver,	Cardiac, liver and endocrine complications are
diabetes, and hypogonadism. Annualized risks	primary comorbidities resulting from high iron
were derived from real world evidence and	associated with beta thalassemia. ^{12,25}
contingent upon baseline iron levels.	
	Experts suggested that mortality seen with
	autologous HSCT would be the best proxy for
	what may be expected with beti-cel in clinical
	practice. Literature-based estimates for acute risk
	of death from autologous HSCT was found to be
The base-case risk of death from beti-cel infusion	2.8%; ³⁰ however, this estimate was derived from
was 1.4% and was tested in sensitivity and	a population with a more severe disease. Input
scenario analyses.	from clinical experts suggested that acute risk of
	Consequently on estimate of 1.4% was doemed a
	reasonable estimate based on the available
	evidence and clinical expert opinion. We explored
	alternate assumptions in sensitivity and scenario
	analyses.
At year seven 0.271% of patients reverted to the	The long-term durability of beti-cel treatment
TD health state (with half the baseline frequency	effect is unknown. Trial data suggest that all

Assumption	Rationale
of transfusions per year) and continued at a rate of 0.271% per year. This rate of reversion resulted in approximately 10% of patients reverting to TD by the end of the lifetime time horizon.	patients who have achieved TI from beti-cel have remained TI; however, these data are based on a limited number of patients (n=32 in Phase III trials) and limited duration of time (7 years of data for 3 patients receiving beti-cel). ²⁶ We heard from an expert in gene therapy that it would be theoretically possible for patients to revert to TD if the population of infused stem cells that were not genetically modified became clonally dominant; it was estimated that over a lifetime post-treatment, approximately 10% of patients would revert to TD. Other expert opinion suggested assuming 0% reversion and this was explored in a scenario analysis.
Percentage of patients adherent to chelation therapy was dependent on the type of chelator used and did impact the cost of treatment. No impact on treatment effectiveness or patient utility was anticipated for patients who are not 100% adherent but remain within a range of good adherence (e.g., 95%). Adherence less than 100% is meant to represent the duration of time where the chelation prescription is not filled by the patient.	Evidence suggested that adherence to chelation therapy varies by type of chelator (3% for patients taking combination therapy to 23% for patients taking deferasirox). ³⁹ Lack of 100% adherence to chelation therapy was expected to be intermittent and not substantially affect patient outcomes given the assumption (above) that iron overload status remains constant for TD patients.
Patients in beti-cel trials who start the process of pre-transplant assessments and preparation but do not proceed with treatment are included in the model.	Preparation for beti-cel transplant (e.g., assessments, tests, visits) incur additional costs that should be accounted for in the model.
The treatment effect of beti-cel determined the proportion of patients entering the transfusion independent and dependent health states of the Markov model.	The primary endpoint of the trial was achievement of transfusion independence, which is defined, in part, as having not received RBC transfusions for 12 months or longer. ²⁵
Mortality was modeled using age and sex specific background mortality rates modified by an increased risk of death due to transfusion dependence (standardized mortality ratio [SMR] 3.9), transfusion independence (SMR 1.25) and cardiac complications (13% risk of death). The transfusion dependent SMR of 3.9 was assumed to account for increased risk of death due to liver and endocrine complications.	Risks associated with ongoing transfusions and chelation therapy, myeloablative conditioning for patients receiving beti-cel, and comorbidities associated with high iron resulted in increased risk of mortality compared to the general population.
The cycle length of the model is one year.	Given the chronic nature of beta thalassemia, a cycle length of one year was expected to appropriately capture health outcomes and costs and allow for sufficient flexibility to explore our planned sensitivity and scenario analyses.

Assumption	Rationale
For model inputs with no evidence-based	Inclusion of parameter uncertainty within one-
specified uncertainty range we used a range of	way and probabilistic analysis allowed for a
+/- 20%.	reasonable characterization of uncertainty.

HSCT: hematopoietic stem cell transplant, QoL: quality of life, RBC: red blood cell, SMR: standardized mortality ratio, SOC: standard of care, TDT: transfusion-dependent β-thalassemia

Model Inputs

Key model inputs included clinical probabilities, utility values, and health care costs as outlined in Tables E2.2 to E2.7 below.

Clinical Inputs

The primary measure of clinical efficacy was consistent with the beti-cel phase III trial endpoint of the proportion of the intention-to-treat (ITT) cohort that achieved transfusion independence (Table E2.2.). Transfusion independence was achieved by 32/36 (88.9%) of the patient population.

Table E2.2. Details of Primary Clinical Efficacy Endpoint

Treatment Phase	Total (Phase III Trial Data)
N (meeting inclusion criteria)	43
n (%) Underwent Apheresis	43 (100.0)
Did not continue, n (%)	2 (4.7)
n (%) Underwent Conditioning	41 (95.3)
Beti-cel infusion, n (%)	41
Number of " <i>unevaluable</i> " patients	5
Transfusion Independence, n/N (%)	32/36 (89)*
Source	Data on file ⁴⁰

N: total number, n: number

* Evaluable patients (i.e., patients with at least 12 months of transfusion independence were considered evaluable)

Iron Complications

The baseline characteristics of the model cohort describe the proportion of a natural history cohort within three levels of iron overload risk related to serum ferritin, liver iron concentration, and myocardial T2.⁴¹ Manufacturer submitted data and longitudinal cohort studies suggest no strong evidence of increases in the proportion of iron overload severity over time. Therefore, we assumed that the cohort will not change in their distribution of iron overload risk categories for those remaining in the TD state. The annualized risk of liver complications, cardiac complications, diabetes, and hypogonadism was based on the three risk levels and were generated from natural history (real world) evidence sources for risk of cardiac complications,⁴¹ liver complications,⁶⁸ and risk of diabetes and hypogonadism (Table E2.3.).⁴²

For those who achieved transfusion independence, a transition period was assumed after which time, individuals shifted to the lowest level of iron overload risk for serum ferritin, liver iron concentration, and myocardial T2. The model incorporated a five-year period of cardiac iron, liver iron, and serum ferritin normalization following successful transplantation. Given the limited data available for optimal normalization periods post-beti-cel infusion, a five-year time period was assumed based on data from patients who underwent an allogeneic HSCT.³⁶ In this study, patients with baseline ferritin levels of \geq 2500ng/mL achieved target ferritin levels (<300ng/mL or <500ng/mL) after 64 months and 65 months, respectively.³⁶

Severity of Overload and Complication Risk	Value	Source
Low Cardiac Complications*	0.0023	NERI ⁴¹ and Kansal et al., 2021 ³³
Moderate Cardiac Complications*	0.0177	NERI ⁴¹ and Kansal et al., 2021 ³³
High Cardiac Complications*	NA	NA
Low Liver Complications ⁺	0	Marketscan and Kansal et al., 2021 ³³
Moderate Liver Complications ⁺	0	Marketscan and Kansal et al., 2021 ³³
High Liver Complications [†]	0.0198	Marketscan ⁶⁸ and Kansal et al. ³³
Relative risk for increased age (year) for	1	Assumption
diabetes	1	Assumption
Relative risk for diabetes given moderate or	19.3	Ang et al ⁴²
high Myocardial T2*	15.5	
Relative risk for diabetes given high serum	14.8	Ang et al ⁴²
ferritin [‡]	14.0	
Relative risk for increased age (year) for	1	Assumption
hypogonadism	-	Assumption
Relative risk for hypogonadism given	3.9	Ang et al ⁴²
moderate or high Myocardial T2*	5.5	
Relative risk for hypogonadism given high	29	Ang et al ⁴²
serum ferritin [‡]	2.5	

Table E2.3. Annualized Risk of Complications

NA: Not applicable

* Low iron, >20 ms; moderate iron, 10–20 ms; high iron, <10 ms

+ Low iron, <7 mg/g; moderate iron, 7–15 mg/g; high iron, \geq 15 mg/g

 \ddagger Low iron, \leq 1,000 ng/mL; moderate iron, 1,000–2,500 ng/mL; high iron, >2,500 ng/mL

Discontinuation

Discontinuation for a one-time gene therapy was not a consideration beyond the intention-to-treat model analysis and assumptions around the durability of beti-cel.

<u>Mortality</u>

During stakeholder correspondences, experts suggested that mortality seen with autologous stem cell transplant would be the best proxy for what may be expected with beti-cel in clinical practice. Although some experts suggested that this mortality risk after transplant may be as high as 5%, due

to no observed deaths in the beti-cel beta thalassemia trials, the base-case risk of death was 1.4% (0% to 5% range for use in sensitivity analyses).³⁸ Beyond the short-run potential harms associated with procedures similar to beti-cel, the long-run risk of mortality was also an important model input. The long-run mortality approach followed the general framework outlined in Kansal et al.³³ First, we estimated all-cause background annual risk of death that is age and sex specific from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.⁶⁹ Then, we applied a standardized mortality ratio to this background annualized mortality risk based on those who are not experiencing cardiac complications and who are in the TD health state (standardized mortality ratio [SMR] = 3.9) or who are in the TI health state (SMR = 1.25). Note that the SMR of 3.9 was based on prior costeffectiveness analyses in beta thalassemia⁷⁰ whereas the SMR for TI was consistent with the Kansal et al. assumption of a 25% increased risk over that of the general population to account for potential long-term effects of undergoing myeloablative conditioning.³³ For those experiencing cardiac complications, we assumed an annualized probability of death of 0.13. The cardiac death risk was an assumption consistent with Kansal et al., that may overestimate death in those of younger ages with cardiac complications but may underestimate death in those of older age. Finally, note that we assumed the annualized SMR of 3.9 includes the risk of death for non-cardiac complications (liver complications and endocrine complications). The SMR model input sensitivity was explored through uncertainty analyses.

Adverse Events

Adverse events (AEs) associated with beti-cel infusion or preparation for infusion included potential infertility from myeloablative conditioning (31% in males; 57% in females based on gonadal function measures taken after bone marrow transplantation for sickle cell disease)^{33,71} and engraftment failure. The model base case assumed no engraftment failures based on the clinical trial data. All other AEs associated with pre-infusion, infusion, and immediate post-infusion monitoring were expected to be managed in hospital and were accounted for in the costs and disutilities associated with beti-cel transfusion.

No AEs were included for AEs associated with RBC transfusion and chelation therapy as they were assumed to be accounted for within TD health state disutilities and monitoring costs.

Health State Utilities

Health state utilities were derived from publicly available literature and/or manufacturer submitted data and we used consistent health state utility values across treatments (i.e., for beti-cel and SOC) evaluated in the model. Age and sex specific utilities⁷² were used over the lifetime of the model with disutilities applied to account for level of transfusion dependence. Health state disutilities were based on a UK study of individuals with TDT.³⁹ Disutilities were calculated based on the difference between the utility score reported for the UK general population (0.91) and the utility scores for TDT estimated from 165 patients with a median age of 24.1 years (25% <12 years of age)

and a median duration of TDT of 9.5 years.³⁹ The EQ-5D-3L and EQ-5D-Y for adult and pediatric patients, respectively, were used to derive utility estimates using the UK-based value set.³⁹ Research has found that patients receiving subcutaneous chelation (deferoxamine) experience greater decreases in quality of life compared to oral chelation. Given that 14% of individuals in Shah 2021³⁹ were receiving subcutaneous deferoxamine, we assumed that the overall disutility for the transfusion dependent health state, on average, accounts for the additional disutility associated with subcutaneous chelation therapy. It is expected that oral chelation will the preferred option moving forward; therefore, the assumed disutility may slightly overestimate the disutility associated with chelation therapy. We used utility data reported in Matza 2021⁴³ – a vignette-based study using time trade off methods from a UK sample with a mean age of 43.2 years – for intervention-related disutilities; however, for the transfusion dependent health state disutility (as described above), we deemed EQ-5D data collected from patients with TDT to be a preferred source.³⁹ Health-related quality of life (HRQoL) data collected in the Northstar-2 and -3 trials were limited by small sample sizes.⁵ No additional disutilities will be included for transfusion and chelation impacts or AEs as they are assumed to be accounted for within health state disutilities.

We also included disutilities for potential infertility from myeloablative conditioning, and disutilities for complications resulting from high iron (i.e., cardiac, liver, and endocrine complications). Disutility for infertility was accounted for in the disutility associated with the transfusion independent health state and transfusion dependent health state (for individuals that do not achieve transfusion independence from beti-cel) and was assumed to apply over the lifetime of the model. Disutilities for cardiac, liver, and endocrine complications were based on a study assessing HRQoL in patients with beta thalassemia in Iran.⁴⁴ This study used the EQ-5D-3L and a US time trade off value set to obtain mean health utility scores from 512 patients with a mean age of 22 years according to the presence or absence of cardiac, liver, and endocrine complications.

Caregiver disutility (-0.03) (for one care giver per patient \leq 26 years of age in the transfusion dependent health state and during the normalization period post-infusion) was included in the societal perspective analysis. The disutility value was based on the same source as used for the derivation of disutilities for the transfusion dependent health state.³⁹

Disutility values are reported in Table E2.4.

Table E2.4. Disutility Values

	Disutility	Source
Health State		
		Shah et al., 2021 39
Transfusion dependent (oral	-0.22 (age ≥16 years)	(Age ≥16 years; n=94)
and subcutaneous chelation)	-0.18 (<16 years)	(Age 4 to 7 years; n=9)
		Assumption (Ages 8 to 15 years; -0.18)
Transfusion independent	-0.02	Kansal et al., 2021 (Assumption) ³³
Intervention (Beti-cel)		
Beti-cel infusion (one year)	-0.31	Matza et al., 2021 ³³
Complications from Iron Overloa	ıd	
Cardiac	-0.03	Seyedifar et al., 2015 ⁴⁴
Liver	-0.03	Seyedifar et al., 2015 ⁴⁴
Diabetes	-0.04	Seyedifar et al., 2015 ⁴⁴
Hypogonadism	-0.04	Seyedifar et al., 2015 ⁴⁴

IV: intravenous

*Potential complications of myeloablative conditioning

Economic Inputs

The model included direct medical costs, including treatment acquisition and administration costs, treatment and condition related monitoring costs, and costs due to complications from iron overload (cardiac, liver, and endocrine complications). Future unrelated health care costs were also included based on age-adjusted health care costs over the lifetime of the model.⁷³ Costs associated with patient and caregiver productivity loss were included in a separate analysis. Where applicable, all costs used in the model were updated to 2021 US dollars.

Drug Acquisition Costs

Beti-cel is currently under regulatory review in the US and therefore does not have a published price. The anticipated acquisition cost of beti-cel was based on a published press release estimate shared by the manufacturer of beti-cel (\$2.1 million US).⁷ This cost is based on a single intravenous infusion of at least 5.0×106 CD34+ cells/kg⁴⁰ and was modeled in the base case using the manufacturer-proposed five-year funding model which is contingent upon treatment success. The first-year cost was \$420,000 US and each of the subsequent four years costs \$420,000 if patients achieve and maintain transfusion independence. To maintain all intervention costs in present value and to avoid potential confusion over discounting, we assumed that all beti-cel payments occur at the start of the model horizon, but we estimated the expected value of payments for the base case consistent with the manufacturer's proposed five-year funding model. For example, if 80% were assumed to succeed for the entire five-year horizon whereas 20% were assumed to fail after the beti-cel infusion (during year one), the expected value base-case payment per person who received beti-cel = (\$2,100,000) * 0.80 + (\$2,100,000 / 5) * 0.20 = \$1,764,000. Subsequent threshold-based

prices and eventual Health Benefit Price Benchmarks will be based on the expected value payment per person who undergo beti-cel transplant.

We also included costs of preparation for beti-cel infusion which includes pre-procedure visits and tests, a period of hyper transfusion, apheresis, and myeloablative conditioning. We assumed that 22% of patients require two cycles of mobilization and apheresis to obtain sufficient cells.²⁵ Post-infusion monitoring requirements and frequency followed the approach used in Kansal 2021.³³ Resource use and costs associated with beti-cel are reported in Tables E2.5.-E2.7.

	Duration	Frequency	Dose	Notes/Source
Pre-procedure visits and tests*	NA	1 time	NA	FINOSE 2019 ⁷⁴ , NICE 2021 ^{75,76}
Pre-transplant hyper transfusion	90 days	1 x every 2 weeks	NA	Kansal et al., 2021 ³³
Filgrastim for mobilization	5 days	1 x per day	10 mcg/kg	Kansal et al., 2021 ³³
Filgrastim home administration	5 days	1 visit per day	NA	Kansal et al., 2021 ³³
Plerixafor for mobilization	2 days	1 x per day	0.24 mg/kg	Kansal et al., 2021 ³³
Apheresis procedure	1 day	1 time	NA	Kansal et al., 2021 ³³
Hospitalization for apheresis procedure	1 day	1 time	NA	Kansal et al., 2021 ³³
Prophylaxis for veno- occlusive disease (Ursodeoxycholic acid)	90 days	2 x per day	300 mg	Kansal et al., 2021 ³³
Prophylaxis for seizures (levetiracetam)	6 days	2 x per day	500 mg	Locatelli et al., 2021; ²⁵ Assumption – during and 1 day prior and 1 day after busulfan
Fertility preservation	NA	1 time	NA	Assumption
Myeloablative conditioning with busulfan (≥18 years)	4 days	1 x per day (3- hour IV infusion)	3.2 mg/kg/day	Bluebird bio, data on file ⁴⁰
Myeloablative conditioning with busulfan (<18 years)	4 days	4 x per day (2- hour infusion)	0.8 mg/kg/day	Bluebird bio, data on file ⁴⁰
Hospitalization for conditioning	At least 6 days	1 time	NA	EMA summary ⁷⁷
Hospitalization for infusion/post-infusion	3 to 6 weeks	1 time	NA	EMA summary ⁷⁷
Post-infusion monitoring ⁺	Years 1-6	Variable	NA	Kansal et al., 2021 ³³

Table E2.5. Resource Use Associated with Intervention

mg: milligrams, NA: not applicable

*Pre-procedure tests include: one outpatient visit, one blood test, one genotyping test, one liver biopsy, and one bone marrow analysis.

⁺Based on the post-transplant monitoring frequency reported in Kansal 2021³³

Resource	Cost	Notes	Source	
Outpatient visit	\$224.25	HCPCS 99205 (Comprehensive outpatient office visit)	Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services - Physician Fee Schedule ⁷⁸	
Blood test	\$10.56	HCPCS 80053 (Blood test, comprehensive group of blood chemicals)	Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services	
Genotyping test	\$324.58	HCPCS 81364 (Gene analysis [hemoglobin, subunit beta] full sequence analysis.)	Fee Schedule (22CLABQ1) ⁷⁹	
Liver Biopsy	\$2,250	US-based	Allen et al., 2018 ⁸⁰ (Assumption)	
Bone marrow analysis	\$143.57	HCPCS 88237 (tissue culture for tumor disorders of bone marrow and blood cells)	Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services – Clinical Laboratory Fee Schedule (22CLABQ1) ⁷⁹	
Home administration of filgrastim	\$646.20	Based on 2020 Physician's Fee and Coding Guide	Kansal et al., 2021 ³³	
Apheresis procedure	\$254.16	Based on 2020 Physician's Fee and Coding Guide	Kansal et al., 2021 ³³	
Hospitalization for apheresis procedure	\$3,935.83	Based on estimates from the HCUP NIS	Kansal et al., 2021 ³³	
Fertility preservation	\$10,000	Medically assisted procreation cost of \$10,000 utilized by 60% of patients*	Kansal et al., 2021 ³³	
Hospitalization for transplant (<18 years)	\$128,298	Based on estimates	Kancal at al. 2021 ³³	
Hospitalization for transplant (≥18 years)	\$71,443	from the HCUP NIS	Kalisal et al., 2021-5	
Post-transplant monitoring (Year 1)	\$8,883	Includes visit with		
Post-transplant monitoring (Year 2)	\$8,772	HCP laboratory tests	Kansal et al 2021 ³³	
Post-transplant monitoring (Years 3- 6)	\$7,734	and imaging studies		

Table E2.6. Unit Costs of Resource Use Associated with Intervention

HCPCS: Healthcare Common Procedures Coding System

*57% of females and 31% of males assumed infertile due to myeloablative conditioning.³³

Ongoing Treatment Costs

Ongoing treatment costs for transfusion dependence included the costs of transfusions, iron chelation therapy, annual monitoring costs for chelation therapy, and any relevant complication costs (cardiac, liver, diabetes, and hypogonadism). We assumed that patients <18 years have an average of 14.95 transfusions per year, and patients ≥18 years have an average of 16.1 transfusions per year which is based on Market Scan data reported in Kansal 2021⁶⁸. The percentage of patients receiving each type of chelation agent and their costs also followed Market Scan data reported in Kansal 2021 and inflated to 2021 US dollars.⁶⁸ Annual acquisition cost of chelation for patients aged <18 years ranged from \$45,100 for deferasirox to \$37,191 for deferiprone and for patients aged ≥18 years ranged from \$45,100 for deferasirox to \$74,382 for deferiprone. Combination deferasirox and deferiprone was the costliest, estimated to be \$82,291 annually for patients aged <18 years and \$168,340 annually for patients aged ≥18 years. Deferoxamine mesylate was the least costly, estimated to be \$1,970 annually for patients aged <18 years, and \$5,253 annually for patients aged ≥18 years, and \$5,253 annually for patients aged ≥18 years with an annual administration cost of \$6,389.

Patients in the TI health state incurred costs during the iron normalization period, (Year 1 to 5) posttransplant monitoring costs (Years 1 to 6 and limited annual monitoring costs Year 7+ - e.g., blood tests), and any relevant complication costs (cardiac, liver, diabetes, and hypogonadism).

Complication Costs

Occurrence of cardiac, liver, or endocrine complications were assumed to incur costs for the lifetime of the model. Annual costs followed the estimates provided in Kansal 2021³³ which include cardiac, liver, and other costs for Year 1 and Year 2 onwards. Costs were inflated to 2021 US dollars and are reported in Table E2.8.

Complication, year	Cost	Notes	Source
Cardiac Complications, Year 1	\$7,980.74	US MarketScan data and Karnon	
Cardiac Complications, Year 2+	\$6,346.73	2012 (UK based study)	
Liver Complications, Year 1	\$1,944.77	US MarketScan data and NHS	Kansal
Liver Complications, Year 2+	\$3,001.52	2015-2016	2021 ³³
Endocrine Complications, Year 1	\$1,059.85	US MarketScan data and Karnon	
Endocrine Complications, Year 2+	\$1,636.07	2012 (UK based study)	

Table E2.7. Complication Costs

Productivity Costs and Other Indirect Costs

We included costs associated with lost productivity due to illness for both patients and caregivers in a modified societal perspective. We assumed one caregiver per patient up to the age of 26 years and our estimates for lost time from work was applied for all patients regardless of age to capture potential impacts to educational attainment and non-market productivity (i.e., lost productivity was included for school-age children and individuals in retirement age). Estimates for lost productivity were derived from a prospective study assessing patient and caregiver reported burden for TDT.⁸¹ This study captured the mean number of daily hours that patients (23% US) spend on managing their illness. This study found that patients spend a total of 688 hours managing illness per year (including for example, time spent on transfusions, traveling to infusions, preparing and taking chelators, making appointments, organization insurance payments, etc.).⁸¹ Using a mean hourly wage of \$27.07/hour⁸² (based on a mean of all US occupations), this would equate to approximately \$18,624 lost annually for both patient and caregiver. This finding aligns well with findings from a UK-based cross-sectional survey of patients and caregivers that reported on absenteeism, presenteeism, and overall productivity loss associated with TDT,³⁹ and reflects our consultation with patients and patient groups which suggest that time spent managing their illness is essentially a "part time job."

Model Outcomes

Model outcomes included total life years (LYs) gained, quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) gained, equal-value life years (evLYs) gained, transfusion dependent years averted, and total costs for each intervention over a lifetime time horizon. Costs, LYs, QALYs, and evLYs were also reported by the health state to understand the contribution of different costs elements. Total costs, LYs, QALYs, and evLYs were reported as discounted values, using a discount rate of 3% per annum.

Description of evLY Calculations

The equal value life year (evLY) considers any extension of life at the same "weight" no matter what treatment is being evaluated or what population is being modeled. Below are the stepwise calculations used to calculate the evLY.

- 1. First, we attribute a utility of 0.851, the age- and gender-adjusted utility of the general population in the US that are considered healthy.⁸³
- 2. We calculate the evLY for each model cycle.
- 3. Within a model cycle, if using the intervention results in additional life years versus the primary comparator, we multiply the general population utility of 0.851 with the additional life years gained (ΔLY gained) within the cycle.
- 4. The life years shared between the intervention and the comparator use the conventional utility estimate for those life years within the cycle.
- 5. The total evLY for a cycle is calculated by summing steps 3 and 4.
- 6. The evLY for the comparator arm is equivalent to the QALY for each model cycle.

7. The total evLYs are then calculated as the sum of evLYs across all model cycles over the time horizon.

Finally, the evLYs gained is the incremental difference in evLYs between the intervention and the comparator arm.

E3. Results

Base-Case Results

Treatment	Treatment Cost*	Transfusion and Chelation Costs ⁺	Total Cost	TD Years	QALYs	Life Years	evLYs
Health Care System Perspective							
Beti-cel	\$1,890,000	\$430,000	\$3,320,000	5.98	39.02	49.02	39.61
SOC	-	\$3,250,000	\$4,060,000	38.36	25.41	38.36	25.41
Modified Societal Perspective							
Beti-cel	\$1,890,000	\$430,000	\$3,550,000	7.26	38.93	49.02	39.53
SOC	-	\$3,250,000	\$4,850,000	38.36	25.29	38.36	25.29

Table E3.1. Undiscounted Results for Beti-cel Compared to SOC

evLY: equal value life year, QALY: quality adjusted life years, SOC: standard of care, TD: transfusion dependent

* Only includes beti-cel acquisition cost (i.e., excludes workup, preparation, transplant, post-transplant monitoring and normalization period costs).

⁺ Only includes transfusion costs and chelation acquisition costs (i.e., excludes chelation administration and monitoring costs)

Table E3.2. Disaggregated Beti-cel and SOC Intervention-related Costs (Base case, discounted)

Treatment	Beti-cel Workup	Beti-cel Transplant	Beti-cel Acquisition	Post-beti- cel Monitoring	Post-beti-cel Iron Normalization	Transfusion	Chelation Acquisition	Chelation Administration and Monitoring
Beti-cel	\$24,000	\$97,000	\$1,890,000	\$43,000	\$160,000	\$164,000	\$95,000	\$133,000
SOC	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$757,000	\$1,059,000
Incremental*	\$24,000	\$97,000	\$1,890,000	\$43,000	\$160,000	\$164,000	\$662,000	\$926,000

evLY: equal value life year, QALY: quality adjusted life years, SOC: standard of care, TD: transfusion dependent *Note: Incremental may not total beti-cel minus SOC costs due to rounding.

Treatment	Cardiac Complication Costs	Liver Complication Costs	Endocrine Complication Costs	Unrelated Medical Costs	Patient and Caregiver Productivity Costs
Beti-cel	\$3,100	\$2,000	\$18,200	\$232,600	\$184,200
SOC	\$5,900	\$4,500	\$19,800	\$190,900	\$482,200
Incremental*	\$(2 <i>,</i> 800)	\$(2,400)	\$(1,600)	\$41,700	\$(298,000)

Table LJ.J. Disaggi egaled Non-Intervention-related Costs (Dase case, discounted)

evLY: equal value life year, QALY: quality adjusted life years, SOC: standard of care, TD: transfusion dependent *Note: Incremental may not total beti-cel minus SOC costs due to rounding.

E4. Sensitivity Analyses

We conducted one-way sensitivity analyses to identify the impact of parameter uncertainty and key drivers of model outcomes. The key inputs and results from the one-way sensitivity analyses can be found in Tables E4.1-E4.5. Figures E4.1-E4.3 present this information graphically by way of a tornado diagram.

Table E4.1. Tornado Diagram Inputs and Results for Beti-cel versus SOC (Health Care Sect	tor
Perspective)	

	Lower Input Incremental CE Ratio	Upper Input Incremental CE Ratio	Lower Input*	Upper Input*
Mean number of transfusions per year	\$139,006	\$45,420	9.79	22.41
Annual cost of chelation therapy	\$125,718	\$58,708	\$41,477	\$62,215
Mean starting age	\$66,010	\$125,570	15.34	29.06
Level of persistence with chelation therapy	\$121,416	\$80,960	82%	100%
Utility decrement for the TD health state	\$77,599	\$113,609	-0.29	-0.15
Duration of serum iron normalization period post-beti-cel transplant	\$75,606	\$100,742	3.04	6.96
SMR for patients with continued TD	\$81,174	\$99,927	2.76	5.04
Durability of beti-cel (annual % of patients reverting per year)	\$84,575	\$101,218	0.00%	0.59%
Annual probability of cardiac complications with moderate baseline iron levels	\$85,811	\$99,497	1.15%	2.53%
Annual cost of monitoring for chelation therapy	\$98,545	\$85,881	\$6,677	\$10,015

CE: cost-effectiveness, SMR: standardized mortality ratio, TD: transfusion dependent

*Note lower input may reflect either upper or lower incremental CE ratio value depending on the direction that the input has on the incremental CE ratio output.



Figure E4.1. Tornado Diagram (Modified Societal Perspective)

SMR: standardized mortality ratio, TD: transfusion dependent, TI: transfusion independence, QALY: quality adjusted life year

Table E4.2. Tornado Diagram Inputs and Results for Beti-cel versus SOC (Modified Societal
Perspective)

	Lower Input Incremental CE Ratio	Upper Input Incremental CE Ratio	Lower Input*	Upper Input*
Mean number of transfusions per year	\$80,144	(\$13,001)	9.79	22.41
Annual cost of chelation therapy	\$66,919	\$225	\$41,477	\$62,215
Mean starting age	(\$2,056)	\$58,063	15.34	29.06
Lost productivity for patient	\$56,340	\$10,804	418	958
Level of persistence with chelation therapy	\$62,637	\$22,372	82%	100%
SMR for patients with continued TD	\$15,169	\$46,632	2.76	5.04
Duration of serum iron normalization period post-beti-cel transplant	\$20,091	\$40,502	3.04	6.96
Annual probability of cardiac complications with moderate baseline iron levels	\$25,462	\$42,798	1.1%	2.5%
Percentage of patients achieving TI from Beti-cel	\$43,975	\$27,405	77%	97%
Durability of beti-cel (annual % of patients reverting per year)	\$26,122	\$42,279	0.00%	0.59%

CE: cost-effectiveness, SMR: standardized mortality ratio, TD: transfusion dependent

*Note lower input may reflect either upper or lower incremental CE ratio value depending on the direction that the input has on the incremental CE ratio output.

Probabilistic sensitivity analyses were also performed by jointly varying all model parameters over 1,000 simulations, then calculating 95% credible range estimates for each model outcome based on the results. Results are presented in Table E4.3 and Table E4.4.

 Table E4.3. Results of Probabilistic Sensitivity Analysis for Beti-cel versus SOC (Health Care System Perspective)

	Beti-cel Mean	SOC Mean	Incremental		
Costs	\$2,730,000	\$2,260,000	\$470,000		
QALYs	19.64 (17.97 to .12)	14.60 (12.51 to 16.52)	5.04 (4.00 to 6.09)		
evLYs	19.80 (18.17 to 21.24)	14.60 (12.51 to 16.52)	5.20 (4.14 to 6.25)		
Incremental CE	¢02.000				
Ratio (\$/QALY)	\$93,000				
Incremental CE		\$90,000			
Ratio (\$/evLY)		\$90,000			

CE: cost-effectiveness, evLY: equal value life year, QALY: quality adjusted life years, SOC: standard of care

 Table E4.4. Results of Probabilistic Sensitivity Analysis for Beti-cel versus SOC (Modified Societal Perspective)

	Beti-cel Mean	SOC Mean	Incremental			
Costs	\$2,890,000	\$2,720,000	\$170,000			
QALYs	19.57 (18.12 to 20.91)	14.45 (12.67 to 16.19)	5.12 (4.09 to 6.18)			
evLYs	19.73 (18.29 to 21.05)	14.45 (12.67 to 16.19)	5.28 (4.21 to 6.33)			
Incremental CE	¢22.000					
Ratio (\$/QALY)	\$33,000					
Incremental CE		¢22.000				
Ratio (\$/evLY)		Ş52,000				

CE: cost-effectiveness, evLY: equal value life year, QALY: quality adjusted life years, SOC: standard of care

Table E4.5. Probabilistic Sensitivity Analysis Cost Per evLY Gained Results: Beti-cel versus SOC

Cost Effective at \$50,000 per evLY Gained	Cost Effective at \$100,000 per evLY Gained	Cost Effective at \$150,000 per evLY Gained	Cost Effective at \$200,000 per evLY Gained				
Health Care System Perspective							
22%	53%	87%	98%				
Modified Societal Perspective							
62%	92%	100%	100%				
	Cost Effective at \$50,000 per evLY Gained pective 22% ective 62%	Cost Effective at \$50,000 per evLY GainedCost Effective at \$100,000 per evLY Gainedpective22%53%ctive62%92%	Cost Effective at \$50,000 per evLY GainedCost Effective at \$100,000 per evLY GainedCost Effective at \$150,000 per evLY Gainedpective22%53%87%ctive62%92%100%				

evLY: equal value life year, QALY: quality adjusted life years, SOC: standard of care

Figure E4.2. Probabilistic Sensitivity Analysis Results: Cost-Effectiveness Cloud, Health Care System Perspective



QALY: quality adjusted life year, SOC: standard of care

Figure E4.3. Probabilistic Sensitivity Analysis Results: Cost-Effectiveness Cloud, Modified Societal Perspective



QALY: quality adjusted life year, SOC: standard of care

E5. Scenario Analyses

Scenario Analysis 3: Cost-offset Cap Scenario

 Table E5.1 Scenario Analysis Results for the Cost-offset Cap Scenario (aligned with base-case results)

Treatment	Comparator	Cost per QALY Gained	Cost per evLY Gained	Cost per Life Year Gained	Cost per TD Year Averted		
Health Care System Perspective							
Beti-cel	SOC	\$92,200	\$89,500	\$167,600	\$24,700		
Modified Societal Perspective							
Beti-cel	SOC	\$33,600	\$33,300	\$61,300	\$9,000		

evLY: equal value life year, QALY: quality adjusted life year, SOC: standard of care, TD: transfusion dependent

Scenario Analysis 5: Phase III Baseline Patient Characteristics

We conducted a scenario analysis based on a baseline cohort of patients that have characteristics consistent with the Phase III trial data for beti-cel (e.g., mean age, percentage female, and level of transfusion dependence). Results are presented in Table E5.2.

Treatment	Comparator	Cost per QALY Gained	Cost per evLY Gained	Cost per Life Year Gained	Cost per TD Year Averted		
Health Care System Perspective							
Beti-cel	SOC	\$60,600	\$59 <i>,</i> 000	\$123,600	\$15,700		
Modified Societal Perspective							
Beti-cel	SOC	Less costly,	Less costly, more	Less costly,	Less costly,		
		more effective	effective	more effective	more effective		

Table E5.2. Scenario Analysis Results using Phase III Baseline Patient Characteristics

evLY: equal value life year, QALY: quality adjusted life year, SOC: standard of care, TD: transfusion dependent

Scenario Analysis 6 – 5- and 10-year time horizons

We conducted a scenario analysis based on alternative model time horizons (5 years and 10 years). Results are presented in Table E5.3 and Table E5.4.

Table E5.3. Scenario Analysis Results Based on a 5-year Time Horizon

Treatment	Comparator	Cost per QALY Gained	Cost per evLY Gained	Cost per Life Year Gained	Cost per TD Year Averted		
Health Care System Perspective							
Beti-cel	SOC	More costly, less effective	More costly, less effective	More costly, less effective	\$369,000		
Modified Societal Perspective							
Beti-cel	el SOC More costly less effective		More costly, less effective	More costly, less effective	\$363,000		

evLY: equal value life year, QALY: quality adjusted life year, SOC: standard of care, TD: transfusion dependent

Table E5.4. Scenario Analysis Results Based on a 10-year Time Horizon

Treatment	Comparator	Cost per QALY Gained	Cost per evLY Gained	Cost per Life Year Gained	Cost per TD Year Averted		
Health Care System Perspective							
Beti-cel	SOC	\$2,092,000	\$2,092,000	More costly, less effective	\$183,000		
Modified Societal Perspective							
Beti-cel	SOC	\$1,901,000	\$2,242,000	More costly, less effective	\$172,000		

evLY: equal value life year, QALY: quality adjusted life year, SOC: standard of care, TD: transfusion dependent

E6. Heterogeneity and Subgroups

Due to small sample sizes in the beti-cel studies, we did not propose any pre-specified subgroup analyses. However, we note that certain model cohort characteristics, such as age, transfusion frequency, and iron overload severity and chelation utilization, may influence the cost-effectiveness findings. We programmed the model to accommodate age subgroups as specified in Table E1.2. We further explored the impact of model cohort characteristics on the cost-effectiveness findings through one-way sensitivity analyses and scenario analyses (see below for scenario list).

E7. Model Validation

Presented in Table E7.1 are the ICER-derived replication findings of the patient-level microsimulation developed by Kansal et al. 2021. Using our cohort-level model, and the assumptions and data inputs reported in Kansal et al. 2021, our model predicted an incremental cost-effectiveness ratio within 5% of Kansal et al.'s 2021 findings.

	ICER Replication		Kansal et al., 2021		% Difference in		
	Beti-cel	SOC	Beti-cel	SOC	incremental (Beti-cel vs. SOC) Findings*		
Effectiveness							
LYs	26.14	22.26	25.64	21.82	1.6%		
QALYs	21.54	14.55	19.96	13.11	1.9%		
Costs							
Beti-cel	\$1,746,169		\$1,704,985		2.4%		
Pre/post beti-cel ⁺	\$252,666		\$241,567		4.6%		
Transfusion/Chelation	\$305,348	\$2,063,162	\$308,718	\$2,005,549	3.6%		
Chelation AEs ‡	\$238.00	\$1,557	\$238.00	\$1,557			
Infertility	\$2,437		\$2,532		3.7%		
Complications	\$20,412	\$29,732	\$18,981	\$31,277	-24.2%		
Total costs	\$2,327,270	\$2,094,451	\$2,277,093	\$2,038,384	-2.5%		
Incremental CE Ratio (/QALY gained) Beti-cel vs. SOC		\$33,352		\$34,848	-4.3%		

Table E7.1 ICER Replication Findings versus Kansal et al. 2021 (Discounted)

AEs: adverse events, CE: cost effectiveness, LYs: life years, SOC: standard of care, QALYs: quality-adjust life years *ICER replication vs. Kansal 2021.

+ Includes pre-transplant, transplant, post-transplant monitoring, and iron chelation during normalization costs.

‡ Chelation AEs not included in the ICER cohort model. Assumed the same costs as Kansal et al., 2021 for the purposes of calculating total costs.

Prior Economic Models

To our knowledge there was only one other peer-reviewed cost-effectiveness analysis journal publication, conducted by Kansal et al.³³, that assessed the cost effectiveness of beti-cel for the treatment of TDT. In addition, we identified a NICE appraisal⁷⁶ and an assessment by the Nordic collaboration of Finland, Norway and Sweden in Health Technology Assessment (FINOSE)⁷⁴ for beti-cel that are relevant for this current ICER review.

All evaluations took a health care system perspective and assessed total cost and outcomes over a lifetime time-horizon. The main focus of all identified reviews of beti-cel was transfusion independence, as well as iron overload as a driver for future cardiac, liver, and endocrine complications, which highlights the impact these complications have on morbidity and mortality in patients with beta thalassemia. As in any one-time gene therapy that is potentially curative, other themes across the above assessments suggest that cost-effectiveness results are sensitive to estimates of annual transfusion dependent utility and transfusion dependent costs (transfusion and chelation cost).
Kansal et al. evaluated beti-cel compared to SOC (including RBC transfusions and chelation therapy) by means of a microsimulation model that tracked patients with TDT.³³ Health states were defined by transfusion requirements (transfusion independence and transfusion dependence), and cardiac, liver, and serum iron levels, which can lead to iron-related complications and death. Transfusion independence (defined as a weighted average total hemoglobin of at least 9 g/dL for at least 12 continuous months after transplantation) was a key effectiveness input in the model. In the base case, patients who achieved transfusion independence were assumed to no longer require chelation therapy after a normalization period, thus minimizing the risk of further iron-related complications. Results suggested that over a lifetime, treatment with beti-cel adds 6.9 QALYs when compared to SOC and an ICER of \$34,833 per QALY gained. Total cost and outcomes were discounted at 3% per annum. Kansal et al., 2021 was a helpful starting point for building our de novo cohort-level model. Key differences between our base-case model and Kansal et al. include:

- We used a small but non-zero likelihood of acute death due to beti-cel (Kansal et al. assumed no added acute death risk beyond a lifetime SMR of 1.25 for patients who achieved TI).
- We used a very small but non-zero likelihood of patients who achieved TI to revert back to requiring transfusions (Kansal et al. assumed no reversion in their base case but did provide estimates in a scenario analysis).
- We used a 5-year duration for normalization for those who achieved TI (Kansal et al. assumed a 1-year duration for cardiac iron normalization and a 3-year duration for serum ferritin and liver iron).
- After the normalization period, we assumed that those older than 12 would remain at a low risk of iron-related complications (Kansal et al. assumed no risk after normalization across all ages).

The NICE assessment evaluated the cost-effectiveness of beti-cel from an NHS perspective using a discrete event simulation approach. In contrast to our review and the assessment conducted by Kansal and colleagues, NICE included a third post-transplant health state, transfusion reduction, in addition to transfusion independence and transfusion dependence. Base-case results from the Evidence Review Group's (ERG) reanalysis suggested that over a lifetime, treatment with beti-cel adds 3.05 QALYs when compared to SOC. Results for the ICERs (£/QALY gained) were redacted. Total cost and outcomes were discounted at a rate of 3.5% in the ERGs reanalysis whereas the manufacturer used a 1.5% discount rate. A key difference between the ERG's reanalysis and our base-case incremental QALY finding of approximately 5.1 was in the disutility values assigned to the health states and NICE's inclusion of a transfusion reduction health state. In our analysis, the difference between TI and TD states in terms of utility was approximately 0.18 (0.18 higher in TI vs. TD) whereas the difference between TI and TD for the ERG's reanalysis was difficult to identify but

based on one-way sensitivity analysis ranges appeared to be much smaller than 0.18. The larger this difference in utility is, the larger the modeled incremental QALYs over a lifetime will be. Further, the ERG's assignment of a proportion of treated patients to the transfusion reduction state (versus transfusion independence state) would further reduce the lifetime modeled health gains.

The FINOSE assessment was based on the manufacturer's dossier submission.⁷⁴ The base-case results from the manufacturer submitted model yielded 8.17 QALYs gained when compared to lifelong SOC. FINOSE raised concerns about whether transfusion independence would be sustained over a life-time time horizon. It was also noted that it would have been preferrable if HRQoL data were collected from the patients in the trials, rather than using a vignette study. Two scenario analyses were conducted by FINOSE, with and without survival gains (Scenario 1 and Scenario 2, respectively), for which three assumptions were adjusted. First, the manufacturer had estimated 20 RBC transfusions per year for patients with TDT, FINOSE found this to be an over-estimation as per international and Nordic treatment guidelines and reduced it to 15 RBC transfusions per year. Second, FINOSE assumed no difference in utility between oral and SC iron chelation therapy. Third, the percentage of patients on oral and SC iron chelation was assumed to be equal (50% each), as opposed to 70% SC and 30% oral treatment assumed by the manufacturer). Scenario 1 resulted in fewer QALYs gained (6.88) at a higher cost compared to the manufacturer's base case. Similarly, scenario 2 resulted in fewer QALYs gained (4.88) at a higher cost. FINOSE concluded that the results of the cost-effectiveness analysis for beti-cel were highly sensitive to the treatment success rate, its durability, as well as mortality and HRQoL inputs.

Admittedly, all modeling approaches may have similar goals of using the best-available evidence, but also require assumptions. Compared to the NICE ERG's reassessment, our approach assigns more lifetime health benefits to beti-cel (3.05 vs. 5.1 QALYs gained) whereas compared to Kansal et al., our approach assigns fewer lifetime health benefits to beti-cel (5.1 vs. 6.9 QALYs gained). Finally, we acknowledge that it is more difficult to compare cost savings across analyses given challenges in transferability and in changes to unit costs over time. We stress that potential cost savings are a key component of value in this assessment and therefore should be included in value assessment deliberations and policy making.

F. Potential Budget Impact: Supplemental Information

F1. Methods

We used results from the same model employed for the cost-effectiveness analyses to estimate total potential budget impact. Potential budget impact was defined as the total differential cost of using each new therapy rather than relevant existing therapy for the treated population, calculated as differential health care costs (including drug costs) minus any offsets in these costs from averted health care events. All costs were undiscounted and estimated over one- and five-year time horizons. The five-year timeframe was of primary interest, given the potential for cost offsets to accrue over time and to allow a more realistic impact on the number of patients treated with the new therapy.

The potential budget impact analysis included the estimated number of individuals in the US who would be eligible for treatment. To estimate the size of the potential candidate populations for treatment, we applied incidence estimates for beta thalassemia (1 in 100,000 individuals; 0.001%)⁴⁶ to the 2022-2027 projected US population ages 2 to 50 years, followed by an estimate for the prevalence of transfusion-dependent beta thalassemia (63.0%).² Lastly, we assumed that only 50% of transfusion-dependent beta thalassemia patients would be eligible to receive beti-cel, due to age or various comorbidities. Applying these sources results in estimates of 666 eligible patients in the US. For the purposes of this analysis, we assumed that 20% of these patients would initiate treatment in each of the five years, or 133 patients per year.

ICER's methods for estimating potential budget impact are described in detail elsewhere and have recently been updated.^{84,85} The intent of our revised approach to budgetary impact is to document the percentage of patients that could be treated at selected prices without crossing a budget impact threshold that is aligned with overall growth in the US economy.

Briefly, we evaluate a new drug that would take market share from one or more drugs and calculate the blended budget impact associated with displacing use of existing therapies with the new intervention. In this analysis, we assumed that beti-cel would displace current treatment with standard of care within the eligible patient population.

Using this approach to estimate potential budget impact, we then compared our estimates to an updated budget impact threshold that represents a potential trigger for policy mechanisms to improve affordability, such as changes to pricing, payment, or patient eligibility. As described in ICER's methods presentation (https://icer-review.org/methodology/icers-methods/icer-value-assessment-framework-2/), this threshold is based on an underlying assumption that health care

costs should not grow much faster than growth in the overall national economy. From this foundational assumption, our potential budget impact threshold is derived using an estimate of growth in US gross domestic product (GDP) +1%, the average number of new drug approvals by the FDA over the most recent two-year period, and the contribution of spending on retail and facility-based drugs to total health care spending.

For 2021-2026, therefore, the five-year annualized potential budget impact threshold that should trigger policy actions to manage access and affordability is calculated to total approximately \$734 million per year for new drugs.

F2. Results

Figure F1 illustrates the cumulative per-patient budget impact calculations for beti-cel compared to standard of care based on the proposed price of \$2.1 million to be paid over 5 years, assuming treatment success. Treatment with beti-cel would result in an average potential budgetary impact of approximately \$399,000 per patient per year when assuming our standard uptake of 20% per year.



